THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

616951

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

6 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLXI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TO THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF JULY, 1906

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1906.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7 Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol.	4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1832
—	9 — 14	3	—	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol.	15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
—	21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol.	26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
—	31 — 35	7	—	1836
—	36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	152 to 161	6	EDWARD VII.	1906

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
  Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
  Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
  War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
  India Office——Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Not in the Cabinet.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. James Bryce, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Winston Churchill, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——Rt. Hon. J. E. Ellis, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Portsmouth.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——Thomas Lough, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. Robertson, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. Kearley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——Walter Runciman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Reginald McKenna, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
  J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
  Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
  Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
  J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Sir John Fisher.
  Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
  Captain H. B. Jackson.
  Captain F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  Lieut.-General Hon. Sir W. G. Lyttelton.
  Lieut.-General C. W. H. Douglas.
  Lieut.-General Sir W. G. Nicholson.
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray.
  The Under Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General——J. Lawson Walton, Esq., M.P.
Solicitor-General——W. S. Robson, Esq., M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of SEFTON.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl GRANVILLE.
- Earl of GRANARD.
- Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
- Lord ACTON.
- Lord DENMAN.
- Lord COLEBROOKE.
- Lord SUFFIELD.

Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR.
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord COLEBROOKE.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. JAMES BRYCE, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——Viscount HAWKESBURY, M.V.O.
Controller to the Lord-Lieutenant's Household——Viscount POWERSCOURT, M.V.O.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. CHERRY, K.C.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. N. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk ——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——H. C. Tower, Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart., S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.
Junior Clerks——B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq., F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq., C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq.; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.; W. P. Johnston, Esq.; J. Barlow, Esq.; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq. C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. Edward Gully, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——John Poyser, Esq. ; W. K. Sanderson, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surrey A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H Hambling.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day, Mr. J. Henderson,
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington, H. G. Emmett, J. L. Philip, W. Findlay.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram and J. Hart.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXI.

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1906.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 17TH JULY, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Viscount Falmouth be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Castlemaine; read, and agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE. — Report from, that the further Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed.

Read, and agreed to 1

Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 1

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill. Reported with Amendments 2

Great Northern Railway Bill.—Reported without Amendments 2

Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to 2

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next 2

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 2

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 2

July 17.]

Page

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill.—Commons' Message of the 5th instant considered (according to Order), then it was moved to resolve—

That the promoters of the Bill which has been introduced into the House of Commons during the present session of Parliament, shall have leave to introduce the same in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon, up to that period, be paid.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit after the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto, signed by the agent, stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

That the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to every stage through which the same shall have passed in the present session; and that no new fees be charged in regard to such stages.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to the said Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session.—(The Chairman of Committees); agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to acquaint them that the Lords had concurred with them in suspending the said Bill .. 2

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; London Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill. House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next 3

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Poole Corporation Water Bill; Cork City Railways and Works Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Malmesbury be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Castlemaine; read, and agreed to 3

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment considered, and agreed to 4

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments .. 4

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [H.L.]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 4

Cardiff Gas Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 4

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—(Barton-upon-Irwell).—Order for the consideration of Standing Order No. 93, read, and discharged 4

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next 4

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Motor Cars (Prosecutions).—Return of all proceedings for offences in connection with the driving of motor cars during the period from July 1st, 1904, to June 30th, 1905. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post) 4

No. 488. Belgium and the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg—Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 19) Warrant 1906; dated June 28th, 1906 4

No. 491. British East Africa and the British Central Africa Protectorate—Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 20) Warrant 1906; dated June 30th, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 4

Alkali, Etc., Works Bill.—Reportedf rom the Standing Committee without Amendment; and to be read 3^{a} on Thursday next 5

Ground Game Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Friday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 159.) 5

Tobacco Growing in Ireland.

Lord Oranmore and Browne 5
Lord Denman 5
The Earl of Denbigh 7
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 8
Viscount Ridley 9
The Earl of Meath 11
The Earl of Camperdown 11
Lord Denman 12

House adjourned at Five o'clock to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 17th JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Private Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders not Previously Inquried into Complied with.)—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the

July 17.] *Page*

Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.. 13

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Portsmouth Water Bill [Lords]; Ritz Hotel Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. As Amended, considered; to be read the third time 13

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed .. 13

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time 13

Crediton Gas Bill [Lords]; Truro Gas Bill [Lords]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]. Reported with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 14

Message from the Lords.

That they have agreed to, London United Tramways Bill; Watford Gas Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881." [Conveyancing Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890." [Settled Land Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Married Women's Property Act, 1882." [Married Women's Property Bill [Lords].

And, also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the municipal and police boundaries of the burgh of Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven; to authorise the provosts, magistrates, and councillors of the burgh to construct a new street; and for other purposes." [Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords] 13

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 14

July 17.] Page

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES)BILL.—Petitions against; From Aikton Dorset; Eryholme; Evenwood; Findon; Horsham; Kirkbampton; Kirkbride, Ludlow; Orton; Penalt; Rosley with Woodside; Thursby (two); Waverton cum Dundraw; and, Wiston; to lie upon the Table .. 14

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law; From Buckden; Chipping Ongar; Geldeston; Great Yarmouth; Headlington Quarry; and, Steynton; to lie upon the Table 15

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.—Petition from Bicester, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 15

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Titwood, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 15

POISONS AND PHARMACY PILL [LORDS].—Petitions for alteration; From North Salford; Southport; and, Wokingham; to lie upon the Table 15

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (WARLIKE OPERATIONS) (KILLED AND WOUNDED).—Return [presented July 16th] to be printed. [No. 262.] 15

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.—Paper [presented July 16th] to be printed. [No. 263.] 15

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 20) Warrant, 1906, dated June 30th, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 15

MOTOR CARS (PROSECUTIONS).—Copy presented, of Return of all proceedings for offences in connection with the driving of Motor Cars during the period from July 1st, 1904, to June 30th, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 15

LAND JUDGE'S COURT (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 11th; *Mr. Clancy*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264.] 15

HUMBER CONSERVANCY COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Report of the Humber Conservancy Commission [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 16

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 16th; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265.] 16

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3671 to 3673 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 16

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered June 18th; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. No. 266.] 16

July 17.]

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

VISITS OF INSPECTOR TO EVICTED FARMS—COUNTY CLARE.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 16

LICENSED PREMISES ON ESTATES OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Hobhouse 17

LICENSED HOUSES OWNED BY ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS IN LANCASHIRE and CHESHIRE.—Question, Mr. Crossley (Cheshire, Altrincham); Answer, Mr. Hobhouse 17

WORLD'S POSTAGE RATES.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 17

DUTIES OF MALE SORTING CLERKS AND TELEGRAPHISTS AT RICHMOND, SURREY. —Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 17

ALLOCATION OF SUBSIDY FOR CARRIAGE OF MAILS BY PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 18

FACTORY ACTS—OVERTIME REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 18

EDUCATION GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Winfrey (Norfolk, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 19

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Birrell 20

CONTROL OF MOTOR OMNIBUS TRAFFIC.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. John Burns 20

STOCK EXCHANGE GAMBLING AND GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Asquith 21

OPIUM EXPERTS FROM INDIA.—Question, Mr. H. J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Mr. Morley 22

ALLEGED IMPROPER SEIZURE OF DEAD PIGS BY SANITARY AUTHORITIES AT COOKSTOWN.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 22

LISMORE SALMON WEIR.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer. Mr. Bryce 23

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

COST OF BATTLESHIPS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, The [illegible] Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 24

BRITISH FIRST CLASS BATTLESHIPS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 24

July 17.]

Page

ARMY PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. H. R. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 24

NORFOLK ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Captain Hervey (Bury St. Edmunds); Answer, Mr. Haldane 25

ARMY AND MILITIA RECRUITS.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. Haldane 25

NATIVE EXECUTION IN INDIA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 25

POPPY CULTIVATION IN BRITISH INDIA.—Questions, Mr. Theodore Taylor and Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answers, Mr. Morley 25

INDO-CHINESE OPIUM TRADE.—Questions, Mr. Baker (Finsbury, E.), Sir H. Cotton; Answers, Mr. Morley 26

INDO-BURMESE OPIUM TRADE.—Question, Mr. Baker; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 27

RAILWAYS IN NORTHERN NIGERIA.—Question, Mr. Walker (Leicestershire, Melton); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 28

POPULATION OF NORTHERN NIGERIA.—Question, Mr. Walker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 29

FLOGGING IN THE CHINESE COMPOUNDS.—Questions, Mr. T. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester), Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 29

KAFFIR LABOURING RECRUITING LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough); Answer, Mr. Churchill 31

SLAVE TRADE IN MOROCCO.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 31

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES AT BELGRADE AND SOFIA.—Question, Mr. Baker; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 32

INSPECTORATE OF THE WELSH COAL FIELD.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 32

MERCHANT SHIPPING LAWS IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 33

VACCINATION PROSECUTION IN CHESTER-LE-STREET.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 33

PRESTON POST OFFICE STAFF.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 34

SCHOOL STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 34

July 17.] *Page*

Regent Street Quadrant.—Question, Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, S.) 35

Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Licensed Houses in Lincoln.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 35

Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Sunday Sale of Drink.—Question, Mr. Mr. Leif Jones; Answer, Mr. Charles Hobhouse 35

Appointment of Charity Trustees.—Question, Mr. Silcock (Somersetshire, Wells); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 36

Scottish Pupil Teachers.—Questions, Mr. Black (Banffshire), Mr. Smeaton; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 37

Portarlington Police Force.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 37

Irish Police Pensions.—Question, Mr. Cogan (Wicklow, E.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 38

The Transvaal Constitution.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) and Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 39

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill.—Special Report from the Select Committee, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 267.] 40

Labourers (Ireland) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 268.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 268.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 312.] 40

NEW BILLS.

Textile Workers (Saturday and Sunday Holidays) (No. 2) Bill.—"To prohibit employment between noon on Saturday and six o'clock on Monday morning in woollen, worsted, and silk factories, and in dyeing and bleaching and dyeing works," presented by Mr. Jowett; supported by Mr. Snowden, Mr. Steadman, Mr. Wardle, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Hudson, and Mr. George Roberts; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 313.] 41

July 17.] *Page*

Absent Voters (Scotland) Bill.—" To facilitate the recording of votes at Parliamentary elections in Scotland by fishermen, sailors, and other persons liable to habitual and necessary absence from their usual residence in pursuit of their calling," presented by Mr. Alexander Black; supported by Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Crombie, and Mr. John Henderson; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 22nd November, and to be printed. [Bill 314.] 41

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the chair.]

Clause 37 :—

Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 41
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 50
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 56
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 61
Sir Wm. Anson (Oxford University) 63
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 65
Mr. Lloyd-George 68
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 69
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 70
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 72
Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.) 74
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 74

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir William Anson 76

Amendment proposed—

" In page 20, line 17, to leave out from the word 'the' to end of subsection, and to insert the words 'local education authorities under Part I. of the Education Act, 1902, and boroughs and urban districts having powers under section three of the same Act.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, " That the words down to 'any' in line 18 stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Lloyd-George 77

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. F. E. Smith 77

Amendment proposed—

" In page 20, line 20, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided that the President of the Board of Education shall be responsible to Parliament for any act of the Welsh Central Committee done in the exercise

of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Committee under this section, and shall have full control over the Committee in respect of the exercise of such powers.' "

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 78
Mr. A. J. Balfour 78

Amendment proposed—

" An order in Council shall provide for the appointment by His Majesty of a Member of Parliament, whether a Member holding office under the Crown or not, who shall be responsible for any act of the Welsh Council done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Council under this section, and shall have full control over the Council in respect of the exercise of such powers."

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 79
Lord Balcarres (*Lancs., Chorley*) 81
Sir William Anson 82
The Solicitor-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 83
Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 84
Mr. A. J. Balfour 86
Sir W. Robson 88
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 89
Col. Williams (*Dorsetshire, W.*) 91
Mr. Lane-Fox (*Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash*) 92
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) .. 92
Mr. A. J. Balfour 95
Mr. Llewellyn Williams (*Carmarthen District*) 96
Lord Balcarres 98

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 279 ; Noes, 50. (Division List No. 225.)

Mr. F. E. Smith 103

Amendment proposed—

" In page 20, line 23, to leave out all the words alfter ' that ' to the end of the subsection, and insert the words 'regulations shall be made by the Board of Education whereby the minority of each of the constituent local authorities shall appont to the council a number of representatives bearing the proportion of one to three to the number appointed by the majority of that authority."—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lloyd-George 104
Mr. Samuel Evans 106

July 17.] *Page*

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 20, line 37, at the end, to insert the words, 'The Order shall provide for the distribution of powers and duties as between the council of Wales, the Board of Education, and the Member appointed to represent the council in Parliament. The following powers and duties shall be reserved to the Board of Education: (a) Any appeal to the Board of Education and the determination of any question under this Act, except where the contrary is specially provided in this Act; (b) The regulation and control of state-aided schools; and (c) All powers and duties of the Board of Education under the Charitable Trust Acts, 1883 to 1894, and the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Bridgeman 106
Mr. William Jones (*Carnarvonshire, Arfon*) 107
Sir William Anson 108
Mr. F. E. Smith 112
Mr. Lloyd-George 113
Mr. A. J. Balfour 114
Sir E. Carson 116
Lord R. Cecil 116
Mr. Lloyd-George 117
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) 118

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 337; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 226.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of Clause 37.

Question put, "That Clause 37, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 395, Noes, 107. (Division List No. 227.)

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Birrell*), put and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill (BY ORDER).

Mr. Menzies (*Lanarkshire, S.*) 127
Mr. R. Balfour (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) 130

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons."—(*Mr. Menzies.*)

July 17.] *Page*

Mr. Rainy (Kilmarnock Burghs) 130
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 131
Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross) 135
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 136
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 136
Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 138

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 50 ; Noes, 202. (Division List No. 228.)

Bill to be considered to-morrow.

Crown Lands [Recovery of Crown Rents].

Resolution reported, " That it is expedient that no proceedings shall be taken by or on behalf of the Crown for enforcing the payment of any quit rent or any other perpetual rent payable to the Crown in Ireland, or any arrears thereof, but within sixty years from the time when such rent was last received by or on behalf of the Crown, and that after such period the right of the Crown to the rent and arrears shall be extinguished in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Crown Lands Acts, 1829 to 1894."

Resolution agreed to 141

Post Office Sites Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 142

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day three months.' "—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 144

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 197 ; Noes, 16. (Division List No. 229.)

Main Question, put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Claude Hay 147
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 147

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment. To be read the third time to-morrow.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [Lords].—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered

Mr. Ridsdale (*Brighton*) 148
Mr. Barran (*Leeds, N.*) 149

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 1, line 5, to leave out the word ' corruptly.' "—(*Mr. Ridsdale.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' corruptly ' stand part of the Bill."

The Attorney-General (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) 150
Mr. Hills (*Durham*) 153
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 154

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

The Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury (*Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey*) 155

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Question again proposed, " That the word ' corruptly ' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 155

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 1, line 27, at the end, to insert the words ' and if it is proved that the said principal in either of the above ways has suffered substantial damages.' "—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Lord Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 157

July 17.] Page

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Lupton 157

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 28, to leave out the words 'a misdemeanour' and insert the words 'an offence.'"—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Lord Turnour 158

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, after the word 'Crown' to insert the words 'or under any Corporation, or any Municipal Borough or District Council, or any Board of Guardians.'"—(*Lord Turnour.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir John Walton 159

Question put, and agreed to.

Words inserted accordingly.

Lord Turnour 159

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, to leave out Sub-section (1) of Clause 2."—(*Lord Turnour.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir John Walton 159

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed 160

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 18TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 161

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [LORDS].—Verbal Amendments made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 161

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 161

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 161

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 161

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Adjourned debate on Second Reading [9th July], further adjourned till Monday next 161

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; and ordered to be read the third time To-morrow 161

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered To-morrow 161

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Consideration deferred till Tuesday next, at a quarter-past Eight of the clock 161

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Blythe; Dean Prior; Thrumpton; and Towyn; to lie upon the Table 162

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Gartree; Mackworth and Markeaton; and Over (two); to lie upon the Table 162

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Littleover, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 162

July 18.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.—Copy presented, of return of Alien Passengers brought to the United Kingdom from Ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ending 30th June, 1906; together with the number of Expulsion Orders made during that period requiring Aliens to leave the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 162

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.—Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1905–6, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 162

REVENUE (COLLECTION OF TAXES).—Return presented Relative thereto [ordered 10th July; *Mr. McCrae*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 269.] 162

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3764 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 162

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Public Records (The Palace Court), Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents belonging to the abolished Court of the King's Palace at Westminster which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act] 163

NAVAL EXPENDITURE (PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS).—Return ordered, of the Naval Expenditure of each of the principal Naval Powers, showing their total estimated Naval Expenditure in each of the last ten years, their Expenditure in each of the years named on new Construction, and the amount of their new Construction in each of those years expressed in tonnage."—(*Mr. Thomasson.*) 163

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND).—Return ordered, "showing the sum levied in each parish in Scotland by way of Assessment for the building and repair of churches and manses, and also for any expenditure on glebes and churchyards, during the 10 years ending the 15th day of May, 1905; also Return to distinguish the parishes in which the Assessment is levied according to the valued rent and those in which it is levied according to the real rent, and to show the total number of heritors assessed for the above purposes in each parish during the said period, distinguishing those at and under £50 of annual value and those above £50 of annual value; and also Return giving the names of those parishes in which no assessment has been levied during the above period."—(*Mr. McCrae.*) 163

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CUSTOMS REGULATIONS AT THE PORT OF LIVERPOOL.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness); Answer, Mr. McKenna 163

SPECIAL ALLOWANCES TO CUSTOMS OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Masterman (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 164

PROMOTION OF CUSTOMS EXAMINING OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Masterman; Answer, Mr. McKenna 165

COAL CONSUMPTION IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Charles Wilson (Hull, W.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 166

July 18.] *Page*

WAGES IN ROYAL DOCKYARDS.—Question, Sir J. Baker (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 166

CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT OF TELEGRAPHS AT GLASGOW—AGE RETIREMENT.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 107

SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMISSION—PUBLICATION OF REPORT.—Question, Sir T. Glen-Coats (Renfrewshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 167

SALE OF MORRAGH BERNARD ESTATE, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 168

CIVIL RIGHTS OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 168

BLACKBURN PUPIL TEACHERS CENTRE.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, Mr. Birrell 169

EYEGLASSES FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars); Answer, Mr. Birrell 170

LAND COMMISSION AND IRISH ESTATES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry.. 170

TIBET PAPERS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley 171

PURCHASE OF THREE-YEAR-OLD HORSES FOR THE ARMY.—Question, Mr. H. R. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Mr. Haldane 171

ARMY—INDIAN DRAFTS.—Question, Lord Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. Haldane 172

BATTALIONS SERVING ON SHORT TOUR.—Question, Lord Castlereagh; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. — 173

ARMY REDUCTIONS—DISPOSAL OF REDUNDANT SOLDIERS.—Question, Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 173

CIVIL EMPLOYMENT OF EX-SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 173

BATTALIONS TO BE DISBANDED—PRESENT DEFICIENCY IN ESTABLISHMENT.—Question, Mr. Stewart-Smith (Westmoreland, Kendal); Answer, Mr. Haldane 174

ARMY REDUCTIONS—EMPLOYMENT FOR FIELD OFFICERS OF GARRISON ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Colonel Walker (Lancashire, Widnes); Answer, Mr. Haldane 175

THE LANCASHIRE ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Colonel Walker; Answer, Mr. Haldane 175

REDUCTION IN THE ROYAL FIELD ARTILLERY.—Question, Major McMicking (Kirkcudbrightshire; Answer, Mr. Haldane 176

RETURN HOME OF REGIMENTS TO BE DISBANDED NOW IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 176

July 18.] *Page*

REINSTATEMENT OF CORPORAL JORDAN, ROYAL SCOTS FUSILIERS, TO HIS ORIGINAL RANK OF QUARTERMASTER SERGEANT.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Haldane 176

THIRD COLDSTREAM GUARDS—DATE OF DEPARTURE FOR EGYPT.—Question, Mr. John Rutherford (Lancashire, Darwen); Answer, Mr. Haldane 177

RESIGNATION OF JOHN P. O'CONNOR, ASSISTANT TEACHER, KANTURCK NO. 1 SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 177

REINSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS—CASES OF JAMES CULNANE AND MRS. ANNE CONNELL.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce 177

ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY'S INQUIRY INTO ADMINISTRATION OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 178

PURCHASE BY FEDERATED MALAY STATES OF SHARES IN TANGOING PAGAR DOET COMPANY.—Question Mr. Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Churchill 179

APPLICATIONS FOR RAISING OF THE RATE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. John Burns 180

SPEED LIMIT OF MOTOR OMNIBUSES IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. John Burns 180

DELAY IN DELIVERY OF LETTERS AT ARDARD, COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 181

NEW SITE FOR MONAGHAN POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 181

THE PETROLEUM ACT AND THE THAMES CONSERVANCY BYE-LAWS.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 181

ACCRINGTON EDUCATION AUTHORITY AND THE HYNDBURN PARK SCHOOL.—Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Birrell 182

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—SUSPENSION OF IMPROVEMENTS PENDING PASSING OF THE EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Col. Warde (Kent, Medway); Answer, Mr. Birrell 182

SALARIES OF ASSISTANT CLERKS (NEW CLASS).—Question, Mr. Snowden; Answer, Mr. McKenna 183

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY OF IRELAND—THIRD CLASS PASSENGERS AND MAIL TRAINS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd George 183

DISBANDING OF VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Haldane 184

ARMY SUPPLIES—HACKFORD PROVISION COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Haldane 184

THE ARMY REDUCTION TRANSFER OF MEN.—Question, Mr. Gibbs; Answer, Mr. Haldane 185

July 18.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL GUNNERY PRACTICE IN THE NORTH SEA.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 184

GERMAN NAVAL STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 185

THE OPERATIONS IN NATAL—TREATMENT OF WOUNDED NATIVES.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent), Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Dalziel (Kirkaldy Burghs), Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth) and Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) and the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 185

SEAMEN'S REMITTANCES.—Questions, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answers, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman for Sir Edward Grey) and the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Burghs) 192

SAN THOMÉ AND PRINCIPÉ.—Question, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford); Answer, Mr. Runciman 193

VACCINATION EXEMPTIONS AT LINCOLN.—Question, Mr. H. R. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department) Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 193

POLICE INQUIRIES.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 193

RETURNS OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Bottomley; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 194

NEW ZEALAND EXPORTS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 194

BIRMINGHAM CELEBRATIONS—CONTINENTAL TORCHES.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Paul (Northampton); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 195

MOTOR 'BUS BRAKES.—Question, Mr. Scarisbrick (Dorsetshire, S.); Answer, The President of The Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 196

LITERATURE FOR THE BLIND—POSTAGE RATES.—Question, Viscount Valentia (Oxford); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton) .. 196

POSTAGE STAMPS AT RAILWAY STATIONS.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 197

POSTAL EMPLOYEES AND VOLUNTEER CAMPS.—Questions, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 197

PUPIL TEACHERS—TRAINING CENTRES.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 197

July 18.] *Page*

FETLAR FUEL SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 198

SANITATION IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 199

VATERSAY COTTARS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 199

CROFTERS ACTS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 200

ROYAL CANAL—BOARD OF CONTROL.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 200

COLONEL MALONE'S WESTMEATH ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Ginnel; Answer, Mr. Bryce 201

BARRIGONE (LIMERICK) EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Bryce 201

IRISH MAGISTRACY.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix); Answer, Mr. Bryce 203

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—MR. WILKINSON'S APPOINTMENT.—Questions, Mr. Meehan and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare); Answers, Mr. Bryce 204

BALLYNOE (CORK) EVICTED TENANT.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N,); Answer, Mr. Bryce 204

BOYCOTTING STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 205

ST. JOHN'S BRIDGE, KILKENNY.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Bryce 205

BOYCOTTING AT DRUMKEERN, LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 206

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL—LOANS.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy); Answer, Mr. Bryce 207

KILMALLOCK COUNCIL'S EXPENSES FOR LABOURERS' COTTAGES SCHEME.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 207

ARBITRATIONS UNDER THE LABOURERS' ACTS.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 208

COMPLAINT AGAINST AN ASSISTANT LAND COMMISSIONER.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 208

LABOURERS ACTS INQUIRIES.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 209

EX-TERN TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 209

KILKEARY LANDS, KILKENNY.—Questions, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 210

July 18.]

Page

CORK EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Kilbride and Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Mr. Bryce 211

CONGESTION—THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell; Answers, Mr. Bryce 212

IRISH POOR LAW MEDICAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 213

SHIMLA RIVER SALMON FISHERY.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Bryce 214

IRISH FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 215

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH AND THE NAVY—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. William Redmond; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 215

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.—Question, Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 216

VOTE FOR IMPERIAL DEFENCE—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 216

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Charles Devlin; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Nolan.

Report to lie upon the Table 217

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Leave to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 270.] 217

Criminal Appeal Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, July 30th, and to be printed. [Bill 316.] 217

NEW BILL.

Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill.—"To facilitate the transmission by post of books and papers impressed for the use of the blind," presented by Mr. Sydney Buxton; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 315.] 217

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

July 18.] *Page*

Clause 38 :—

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) .. 218

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, after the word 'schools' to insert the words 'and to the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Acland (*Yorkshire, Richmond*) 218

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, after the word 'schools' to insert the words 'to schools for demonstration and practice connected with training colleges inspected by the Board of Education.' "—(*Mr. Acland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 220
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 220
Mr. Birrell 220

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) 220

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, after the word 'schools,' to insert the words to any certified efficient school provided that one-half of the scholars attending the school are children boarded out under the regulations of the Local Government Board.' "—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 221
Mr. Boland 221
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 222

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, to leave out the words 'with the consent of the local education authority.' "—(*Mr. Hedges.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Lord Balcarres 222

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, to leave out from the word 'and' to the end of the clause."—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 223

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 224

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 39 :—

Sir William Anson 224

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 10, after the word 'made' to insert the words 'or withheld.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 225
Mr. Birrell 226
Mr. Burdett Coutts (*Westminster*) 226

Question put, and agreed to.

Question, "That Clause 39, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 40 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 17, to leave out from the word 'enactment' to end of Sub-section (1)."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Question, "That Clause 40, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Birrell 227

New Clause—

"(1) If the local education authority refuse to agree to any arrangement offered to them as respects the use of a schoolhouse by the owners thereof or if the owners of a schoolhouse refuse to agree to any arrangement as respects the use of the schoolhouse offered to them by the local education authority, the owners of the schoolhouse or the local education authority, as the case may be, may appeal to the Board of Education, and that Board may, if they consider that the school is required for the purpose of providing sufficient public school accommodation, and that the schoolhouse is structurally suitable, and that there are no other reasonable grounds for refusal, by order make an arrangement under this section with respect to the use of the schoolhouse on such terms as may be contained in the order, and any order so made shall have effect as if it was an arrangement made under this Act between the parties. Provided that (a) No arrangement so made by order of the Board of Education shall have effect for more than five years; and (b) A guarantee by the owners of a schoolhouse themselves effectively to continue the school as a certified efficient school for a period of at least five years shall be treated as a reasonable ground for their refusal to agree to an arrangement with the local education authority. (2) Where an appeal under this section is made in respect of a schoolhouse subject to charitable trusts, and the Board of Education make an order on the appeal, the Board, in fixing the payment (if any) to be made by the local education authority for the use of the schoolhouse shall have regard to the extent to which effect is given to those trusts by the arrangement. (3) It shall be the duty of the local education authority and the owners of the schoolhouse respectively to comply with any terms contained in an arrangement made by an order of the Board of Education under this section. (4) The right of appeal given by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any right of appeal given by this Act as regards the schoolhouse of a school in respect of which extended facilities are desired."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) 231
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 232
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 233
Dr. Macnamara 237
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 239
The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (*Sir Henry Fowler, Wolverhampton, E.*) 240
Mr. Austen Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 242

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 327. (Division List No. 230.)

Mr. Birrell 245

Amendment proposed—

"In page 15, after clause 25, insert the following clause:—(1) The council of every county shall, subject to the provisions of this section, within two years after the passing of this Act, prepare a scheme for the purpose of delegating throughout their county to representative bodies as defined by this section some of their powers and duties with respect to elementary education, and shall as soon as may be after the passing of this Act obtain information for the purpose of making such a scheme by public local inquiries and other means.

"No power of making a by-law under Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, or of incurring expenses in respect of capital expenditure or rent on account of the provision or improvement of a public elementary school, and no power or duty in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers, shall be delegated under the scheme, without prejudice, however, to any power of delegation (otherwise than by scheme) under this or any other Act.

"(2) Where powers and duties are delegated to a representative body, under a scheme made in pursuance of this section, the county council shall charge on the area for which the representative body acts (in this section referred to as 'the delegation area') the whole or some proportion of the expenses of carrying out the power and duties delegated, or any amount of those expenses which exceeds some specified sum or limit, and may in addition if provision is made for the purpose by the scheme, charge on the delegation area any expense which appears to the county council to have been caused by any neglect or default of the representative body to perform the duties delegated to them, or through the withholding of any grant due to any such neglect or default.

"(3) The provisions of the scheme as to the powers and duties delegated, and as to the charging of expenses shall be uniform as respects all the delegation areas in the county.

"(4) A delegation area must be either a local government area or a combination of local government areas, and the areas combined need not necessarily be contiguous. A representative body must be either—(a) a body elected for the purpose in manner provided by the scheme by the local government or parochial electors for the delegation area, on which women shall be capable of being elected; or (b) the council of the local government area, where that is possible owing to the delegation area being a single local government area; or (c) a body composed of members of the councils of such local government areas wholly or partly situate in the delegation area as the scheme directs, and appointed by those councils in such manner and proportions and subject to such conditions as may be provided by the scheme, and, if the scheme so directs, of additional members nominated in manner provided by the scheme, and not exceeding in number one-fourth of the total number of the representative body; For the purposes of this provision in the case of a local government area being a parish not having a parish council, parochial electors shall be substituted for members of the parish council and the parish meeting shall be substituted for the parish council. Women shall be capable of being nominated as such additional members, and the scheme shall provide for the inclusion of some women amongst the members so nominated.

"(5) Every scheme prepared under this section shall be submitted to the Board of Education, and shall be approved by the Board if they are satisfied that proper inquiries have been made before preparing the scheme, and that an opportunity has been given to persons interested in the matter for expressing their views on any scheme so prepared, and that the scheme is within the powers given by this section. On the approval of a scheme by the Board of Education, the scheme shall have effect as if enacted by this Act.

"(6) If, after obtaining information for the purpose of a scheme under this section, the council of a county having a population according to the last census of less than 65,000, pass a resolution that a scheme is not necessary in their case having regard to the special circumstances of their county, and make a special report on the subject to the Board of Education, the Board of Education may, if they think fit, exempt that council from the obligation to make a scheme under this section, but the council may at any time, if they think fit, make such a scheme, although the scheme is not prepared within the time limited by this section.

"(7) A scheme under this section may be altered or amended by a subsequent scheme made in accordance with the provisions thereof, and a county council may at any time make such a scheme for the purpose.

"(8) A county council shall not be under any obligation to appoint managers under Section 6 of the Education Act, 1902, for a public elementary school if they consider that the management of the school is properly provided for by delegation to a representative body.

"(9) The accounts of the receipts and expenditure of a representative body under this section shall be made up and audited in like manner and subject to the same provisions (including penal provisions) as the accounts of a local education authority. Provided that if, in any case, the Local Government Board so determine, those accounts shall be audited as accounts of the county council, and in that case the auditor shall have the same power with respect to members of the representative body and their officers as he would have if those members and officers were officers of the county council.

"(10) Any council having powers under the Education Act, 1902, shall, in addition to the powers given by the foregoing provisions of this section, have power to delegate to any persons or body of persons, with or without any restrictions or conditions, as they think fit, any of their powers and duties under the Education Acts, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money, or the power to charge any expenses incurred under those Acts separately on any area.

"(11) If any local authority who are elected by the local government or parochial electors of their area, or any representative body for any delegation area under this section, request the council of the county in which the area is situated to incur specially for the benefit of that area expenditure in relation to elementary education beyond the normal expenditure in the rest of the county, the county council may, if they think fit, charge the expenditure so incurred separately upon that area.

"(12) In this section—The expression 'county' does not include a county borough or the county of London, and does not include any part of a county which is not included in the area of the county council as local education authority under Part 3 of the Education Act, 1902. The expression 'local government area' means a borough, an urban or a rural district council, or a parish."

Page

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, " That this clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 251
Lord Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) 251
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 253
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) 254
Sir William Anson 256
Mr. Stuart (Sunderland) 258
Lord Balcarres 258
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 262
Mr. A. J. Balfour 263
Dr. Macnamara 263
Mr. Lane Fox (Yorkshire W.R., Barkston Ash) 265
Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) 266
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 267

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

Viscount Morpeth 269

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

" In line 1, to leave out the word 'shall' and insert the word 'may.' "—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Question proposed, " That the word 'shall' stand part of the proposed new clause."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 270
Lord Balcarres 270
Mr. Adkins 271
Mr. Birrell 271

Amendment negatived.

Viscount Morpeth 271

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

" In line 3, to leave out after the word 'delegating' to the word 'some' in line 4."—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

Mr. Lough 272

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir William Anson 272

July 18.] Page

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"At the commencement of line 8, to insert 'No powers in respect of the transfer of voluntary schools or the grant or withdrawal of facilities for religious instruction of some special character, and' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Channing 273
Mr. Lough 273
Mr. Adkins 274
Sir William Anson 274

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Viscount Morpeth 274

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 8, after the word 'making,' to insert the words 'or enforcing.' "—(*Lord Morpeth.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Adkins 275
Mr. Lough 276
Sir William Anson 276

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 45 ; Noes, 262. (Division List No. 231.)

Mr. Channing 279

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'except where the county council has authorised any proposal and estimate relating thereto.' "—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lough 280
Sir William Anson 281

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Everett (*Suffolk, Woodbridge*) 281

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 12, to leave out the words 'engagement, dismissal, and :' "—(*Mr. Everett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

Page
Dr. Macnamara 282
Mr. Lough 282
Mr. Silcock (*Somersetshire, Wells*) 283
Viscount Morpeth 283
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 284
Sir William Anson 284
Mr. Lough 285
Mr. Cheetham (*Stalybridge*) 285
Mr. Cave 286
Lord R. Cecil 286
Mr. Adkin 287
Dr. Macnamara 287
Mr. Birrell 288
Mr. George White 288
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) 289
Mr. Birrell 290
Mr. Lane Fox 290

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 333 ; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 232.)

Mr. Cheetham 293

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 17, to leave out the word 'shall' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. Cheetham.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the proposed new clause."

Mr. Lough 294

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.
Mr. Lane Fox 295

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—
"In lines 18 and 19 to leave out the words " or some proportion.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

Mr. Lough 295
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (*Lincolnshire, Horncastle*) 296
Sir E. Carson (*Dublin University*) 296
Viscount Helmsley 296
Mr. Hicks Beach (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 296

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words 'or some proportion' stand part of the proposed new clause."

July 18.] Page

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 371 ; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 233.)

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of the Government new clauses and of the schedules to the Bill, and the Question necessary to bring to a conclusion the Committee stage of the Bill.

Question put, " That the clause (Schemes with reference to delegation) be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 365 ; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 234.)

Another new clause (Power to require use of schoolhouse for educational purposes out of school hours)—(*Mr. Birrell*)—brought up, and read the first and second time.

Question put, " That the clause be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 370 ; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 235.)

Another new clause (Allowance to teachers losing employment in consequence of this Act)—(*Mr. Birrell*)—brought up, and added to the Bill.

Second schedule :—

Amendments made.

Question put, " That the schedule, as amended, be the schedule of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 359 ; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 236.)

Question put, " That the Chairman do report the Bill, as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 303 ; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 237.)

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 317.]

Revenue Bill.

Order for Second Reading read.

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 319

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Victor Cavendish (*Derbyshire, W.*) 326
Mr. William Redmond (*Clare, E.*) 326
Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) 327
Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 327
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 328
Mr. Harmood-Banner (*Liverpool, Everton*) 330
The Chancellor of the Excehquer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 330

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 332

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 332
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 334

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question put, "That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the Consolidated Fund of such sums as may be required to make good any liabilities incurred by the public trustee, or his officers, appointed under any Act of the present session to provide for the appointment of a public trustee, and to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of the salaries or remuneration of the public trustee and his officers, and of other expenses incurred by them in pursuance of such Act."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Mr. Claude Hay 334
Mr. R. Pearce (Staffs., Leek) 334
Mr. J. M. Henderson 335

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 175 ; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 238.)

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

Bills of Exchange (1882) Amendment Bill.—Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 337

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time and passed.

July 18.] *Page*

Marriage with Foreigners Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Claude Hay 339
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 339

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

Extradition Bill. [H.L.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Claude Hay 339
Mr. Herbert Samuel 339

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs (Remuneration).—Order for Committee thereupon read, and discharged 340

Greenwich Hospital.—Resolved, "That the statement of the estimated income and expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation, for the year 1906–7, be approved."—(*Mr. Lambert.*) 340

Revenue Excise Duty, etc.—Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of an Excise Duty on licences to be taken out by manufacturers for sale of British wines and of a Stamp Duty on awards in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other purposes connected with finance, and of authorising the payment of other expenses that may be incurred under such Act (King's recommendation signified), this day.—(*Mr. Whitley.*) .. 340

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put pursuant to the Order of the House of July 13th.

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 19TH JULY, 1906.

The Right Hon. Leonard Henry Courtney, having been created Baron Courtney of Penwith, in the county of Cornwall, was (in the usual manner) introduced 341

July 19.] *Page*

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Hampstead Garden Suburb. The same was ordered to lie on the Table 341

Sutton District Water Bill; Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly 341

Edinburgh Corporation Bill; Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 341

Sutton District Water Bill; Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 341

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Committed for Tuesday next 341

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; Leave given to the Select Committee not to sit again till Monday next 341

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]; Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 341

Pontefract Corporotion Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 342

Poole Corporation Water Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 342

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 342

Cork City Railways and Works Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 342

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Castlemaine be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Earl of Malmesbury; read, and agreed to 342

Sutton District Water Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Sutton District Water Bill; read, and agreed to: All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill 342

July 19.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 342

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments made: Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 342

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Sunday Trading.—Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 160.) Minutes of Evidence, together with appendices, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out .. 343

Trade Reports: Annual Series.

No. 3671, France (Madagascar);

No. 3672. Italy (Province of Leece);

No. 3673. Hayti;

No. 3674. China (Shanghai). 343

Queen's College, Cork.—Annual Report of the President for the session 1905–6 343

Aliens Act, 1905.—Return of alien passengers brought to the United Kingdom from ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ended 30th June, 1906; together with the number of expulsion orders made during that period requiring aliens to leave the United Kingdom. 343

Humber Conservancy Commission.—Report of the Humber Conservancy Commission 343

Customs.—Fiftieth Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs (for the year ended 31st March, 1906).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 343

Public Records (The Palace Court).—Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents belonging to the abolished Court of the King's Palace at Westminster which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 343

NEW BILLS.

Public Slaughter Houses Bill [H.L.]—A Bill to amend the law respecting public slaughter-houses, was presented by the Viscount Hutchison (*E. Donoughmore*); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 166.) 344

Post Office Sites Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 161.) 344

Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill. (No. 162.)—Isle of Man (Customs) Bill. (No. 163.) Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}, and to be printed 344

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Friday, the 27th instant. (The Earl Carrington.) (No. 164.) 344

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Thursday next (The Lord Chancellor). (No. 165.) 344

THE PALACE OF WESTMINSTER.

Lord Stanmore 344

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report with respect to the unfinished condition of the rooms in the Palace of Westminster appropriated to the service of this House, and their approaches."—(*Lord Stanmore.*)

The Earl of Plymouth 346
The Lord Steward of the Household (*The Earl of Liverpool*) 346

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

MACEDONIA.

Lord Newton 346
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) .. 349

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 19TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow 352

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 352

July 19.] Page

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 352

Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 352

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 352

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 352

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time to-morrow 352

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to, Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords].

Amendments to Newport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [Lords]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Hammersmith, City and North East London Railway Bill.—That they concur with the Commons in their Message of the 5th instant in suspending the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill 353

PETITIONS.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions against; from Aikton (three); Benhall; Brandon; Brinkworth; Cumrew; Parkeston; Salehurst; Wigton (two); and Wiltshire; to lie upon the Table 353

Education (England and Wales) Bill (Religious Teaching).—Petition from Salehurst (two); against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table .. 353

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions for alteration: from Forsbrook; and Wreay; to lie upon the Table 353

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill.—Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table 353

Infant Life Protection.—Petition from Dartford, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 353

Licensing Acts.—Petition from Carlisle, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 353

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords].—Petition from Stockport, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 354

July 19.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CUSTOMS.—Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report of the Commissioners of Customs for the year ended 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 354

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1906–7).—Estimate presented, of the further sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 271.] 354

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th June; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.. [No. 272.] 354

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Councils of the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees, and of the County Borough of Wigan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Boroughs [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 354

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3675 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 354

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Caledonian Canal. Copy of One hundred and first Report of the Commissioners [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 273] 354

CYPRUS.—Return ordered, of all sums paid in the year 1905–6 out of the moneys arising from the Revenues of Cyprus, in discharge of the Interest upon the Turkish Loan guaranteed by this country and France in 1855; of all the sums voted by Parliament during the year in aid of the Administration of Cyprus; and of the Surplus remaining over and above the payments made, with interest thereon (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No, 281, of Session 1905).—(*Sir Carne Rasch.*) 354

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NON-PENSION WATCHERS' WAGES.—Question, Mr. Masterman (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 355

RUSSIAN DUTIES.—Question, Sir Edward Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 355

ROUMANIAN CUSTOMS TARIFF ON SYPHONS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 355

ATTACK ON A BRITISH SOLDIER AT MEX.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 356

MURDER OF A EUROPEAN AT BUSRA.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 356

COUNTESS OF KINGSTON'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 357

July 19.]

Page

Auchnacloy Police.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 357

Donery Evicted Tenant.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 357

Cattle Outrage near Loughrea.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 358

Emigration of Stoney Estate Tenants.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell (Mayo, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 358

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 359

Ballinrobe Canal.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 360

Stoney Estate, Newport.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 361

Clanmorris Estate Dispute.—Question, Mr. William O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 362

Sir John Nugent Humble's Estate.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 363

Woodroffe Estate, Lismore.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 364

Guns for the Volunteers.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 365

Coldstream Guards.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 365

Army Wastage.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Haldane 366

Volunteers and Naval Fortresses.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott; Answer, Mr. Haldane 366

Volunteer Camps.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 367

British Army in India.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 367

Reduction of the Army.—Question, Lord J. Joicey-Cecil (Lincolnshire, Stamford); Answer, Mr. Haldane 367

General Bullock.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 367

Troops Ready for Mobilisation.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 368

Reservists.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Haldane 368

Artillery Volunteers.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Haldane 368

July 19.] *Page*

JAPANESE ARMY.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 369

COMMITTEE ON A TERRITORIAL ARMY.—Question, Mr. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 369

DENSHAWI SENTENCES.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 370

RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT AND MR. GEDDES.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 370

MANCHESTER POLICE.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 371

SALFORD COUNCIL SCHOOL FEES.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 371

REGISTER OF TEACHERS.—Question, Dr. G. Kekewich (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Birrell 371

OVERTIME AT DEVONPORT DOCKYARD.—Question, Dr. John Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 371

CHORLTON RELIEVING OFFICER.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Mr. John Burns 372

VAGRANCY.—Question, Mr. Brodie (Surrey, Reigate); Answer, Mr. John Burns 372

SUPERVISORS OF INLAND REVENUE.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, Mr. McKenna 373

TRADE UNION REPORTS ON UNEMPLOYED.—Question, Mr. Snowden; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 373

GREAT NORTH OF IRELAND RAILWAY DELAYS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 374

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY SIDINGS.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 374

RAILWAY COMPANIES' CAPITAL.—Question, Mr. Hyde (Wednesbury); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 375

CARNARVON CASTLE.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 375

LIQUOR TRADE IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Morley 375

LAMBERT ESTATE ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 376

TEAGH NATIONAL SCHOOL, NEWBLISS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 376

July 19.] *Page*

Mountain Batteries in India.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Haldane 377

Army Stations.—Question, Mr. Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 377

General Staff.—Question, Mr. Robert Hobart (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Haldane 377

War Stores Inquiry.—Question, Sir Robert Hobart; Answer, Mr. Haldane 378

Yealm Fishery, South Devon.—Question, Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 378

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Montagu."—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) .. 378

Cocaine Consumption in Delhi.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs).. 379

Rewards for Tiger Slaying.—Questions, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Mr. Morley 379

Indian Military Expenditure.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Morley 380

Partition of Bengal.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley 381

Salt Tax.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Morley 381

Poppy Industry in Baroda.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answer, Mr. Morley 382

Opium in the Nizam's Territory.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answer, Mr. Morley 382

British Indians in Natal.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Morley 382

Poppy Cultivation in India.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, Mr. Morley 383

The Swadeshi Movement.—Question, Mr. Lees; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 383

Protestant Services in Malta.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), and Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 384

Religious Processions in Malta.—Questions, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.), and Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answers, Mr. Churchill 385

July 19.] *Page*

THE RAND REGISTER.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, W.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 386

THE NATAL RISING.—Question, Mr. Byles, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke on Trent), Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.), Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.), and Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answers, Mr. Churchill 387

OPIUM REVENUE OF THE MALAY SETTLEMENTS.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Churchill 388

ARREST OF CHIEF KULA.—Questions, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answers, Mr. Churchill 389

CONDUCT OF NATIVE LEVIES IN NATAL.—Questions, Mr. Alden and Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answers, Mr. Churchill 390

CHINESE AMUSEMENTS ON THE RAND.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Churchill 390

BRITISH REPRESENTATION IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 390

CHARGES AGAINST BRITISH SOLDIERS IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 391

PASOVA BOUNDARY DISPUTE.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 391

CASE OF MR. STANNARD.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 392

SERVIAN REGICIDES.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 392

EGYPTIAN PENSIONS FOR BRITISH OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 392

EDUCATION OF EGYPTIANS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 393

BRITISH TRADE IN MANCHURIA.—Question, Mr. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 393

TREATMENT OF LUNATICS.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 393

MOTOR ACCIDENTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 394

METROPOLITAN POLICE AND INSTRUCTION IN YIDDISH.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 394

D'ANGELEY CASE.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 395

GLOUCESTER LEVEL COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Rendall (Gloucestershire, Thornbury); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 395

July 19.] *Page*

INSPECTION OF THE WELSH MINES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 396

MONMOUTHSHIRE MINES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 396

AMERICAN LEATHER.—Question, Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 396

MOTOR ACCIDENTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 397

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION IN SHEFFIELD.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 397

OWERS LIGHT SHIP.—Questions, Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 398

BOARD OF TRADE REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 399

WEST HAM WORKHOUSE INFANT SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 399

DEATH FROM MENINGITIS AT MARLBOROUGH.—Question, Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire, Devizes); Answer, Mr. John Burns 400

WITHINGTON WORKHOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Fullerton (Cumberland, Egremont); Answers, Mr. John Burns 401

KINDER RESERVOIR, DERBYSHIRE.—Question, Mr. J. Ward; Answer, Mr. John Burns 401

PROMOTIONS OF SORTERS AT THE SOUTH-EASTERN DISTRICT OFFICE.—Question, Dr. Cooper; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 402

SALCOMBE TELEGRAPH SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 402

HALFPENNY POSTAGE.—Question, Mr. Billson (Staffordshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 403

MAIL BAG CLOTH.—Question, Mr. Wilkie (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 403

PUBLIC TRUSTEE BILL.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) 403

REGISTRATION OF TRADES UNION BADGES.—Question, Mr. Richardson (Nottingham, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 404

LIQUOR DUTIES.—Questions, Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln); Answers, Mr. McKenna 404

July 19.] *Page*

VACCINATION OF PUPIL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Liddell (Down, W.); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, S.) 405

EXPENSES OF RELIGIOUS TEACHING.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 466

TEACHERS' PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. J. H. Duncan (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley); Answer, Mr. Lough 406

SCOTTISH TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 406

MOTOR CARS IN SUTHERLANDSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 407

DRAINAGE OF THE OWENMORE.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 407

PRIMARY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 408

IRISH LANGUAGE IN NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Halpin (Clare W.) and Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 408

SUNDAY BAND PRACTICE AT GEVAGH.— Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Bryce 409

WATERFORD EVICTED TENANTS. — Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 409

BALLINROBE AND CLAREMORRIS RAILWAY. — Question, Mr. John O'Donnell (Mayo, S.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 410

COOLIE OUTRAGES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 411

TRAWLERS' CERTIFICATE SUSPENSION BILL.—Questions, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Weir; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.. 411

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. Goddard (Ipswich); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 412

THE ARMY ESTIMATES DEBATE.—Questions, Mr. F.E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 413

THE NATAL RISING.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 413

Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 274.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed [No. 274.]

July 19.] Page

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 318.] 418

SUNDAY TRADING.—Report from the Joint Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.
Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 275.] 418

ADJOURNMENT.—Mr. F. E. SMITH, Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the avowed intention of His Majesty's Government to commence forthwith reductions in His Majesty's armed forces which have not received the sanction of Parliament;" and, the pleasure of the House having been signified, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past Eight this evening 418

NEW BILL.

Church Discipline (No. 2) Bill.—"To amend The Church Discipline Act, 1840, and the Public Worship Act, 1874," presented by Mr. Austin Taylor; supported by Mr. David MacIver, Mr. Channing, Mr. Paul, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Sir Joseph Leese, and Mr. Armitage; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 319.] 418

Explosives Bill.—"To amend the Explosives Act, 1875," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Claude Hay and Sir William Evans-Gordon; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 24th October, and to be printed. [Bill 320.] 419

SUPPLY (17TH ALLOTTED DAY.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair].

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7. CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £147,470, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board."

The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 419
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 429
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 434
Mr. Masterman (West Ham, N.) 438
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 440
Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) 444
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 448
Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead) 449
Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 451

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 454
Mr. George Roberts (Norwich) 455
Mr. George Roberts (Norwich) 455
Mr. Ellis Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 457
Mr. G. A. Hardy (Suffolk, Stowmarket) 459
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 459
Mr. John Burns 460
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) 464
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 464

And, it being a quarter past eight of the clock, and leave having been given to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 10, further proceeding stood postponed without Question put.

THE PROPOSED ARMY REDUCTIONS.

Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 464
Lord Castlereagh (Maidstone) 472

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. F. E. Smith*).

Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 474
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 478
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) .. 482
Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon) 488
Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) 491
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 494
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 497
Major Anstruther-Gray, (St. Andrews Burghs) 498

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Motion for Adjournment lapsed without Question put.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next 499

Deanery of Manchester Bill:—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 500

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

July 19.]

Page

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 500

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn;

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

Open Spaces Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Claude Hay .. 501

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words, 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) .. 502

Amendment negatived.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Musical Copyright Bill.

As amended, considered.

Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) .. 502
Mr. Byles (*Salford, N.*) .. 502
Mr. Lupton (*Lincs, Sleaford*) .. 503

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'work' to insert the words, 'which he knows to be pirated.'"—(*Mr. Byles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 503
Mr. Crean (*Cork, S.E.*) .. 504
Mr. T. M. Healey .. 504
Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) .. 505
Mr. Bertram (*Herts, Hitchin*) .. 505
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) .. 506
The Attorney-General (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) .. 508

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 69 ; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 239.)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, line 14, after the word 'constable' to insert 'if instructed in writing by the owner of the copyright or his agent.'"—(*Mr. Lupton*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. T. M. Healy 512
Mr. Gladstone 514
Mr. Morton 514
Mr. Crean 514
Mr. Duffy (*Galway, S.*) 515
Mr. O'Hare (*Monaghan, N.*) 515
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancs, Clitheroe*) 516
Sir John Walton 516
Mr. H. H. Marks (*Kent, Thanet*) 518

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 44 ; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 240.)

Mr. Crean 521

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, line 16, at end, to add the words 'if such person has already been convicted of an offence under this Act.'"—(*Mr. Crean.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. T. M. Healy 521

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 50 ; Noes, 151 (Division List No. 241.)

Bill to be read a third time upon Monday next.

Marriage with Foreigners Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :—

Sir E. Carson (*Dublin University*) 525

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 3, after the word 'may' to add the words 'if the law in such foreign countries requires the production of any such certificates as is hereinafter mentioned.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 525

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clauses 1 to 7 agreed to.

On the schedule.

Lord Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) 528
Mr. Herbert Samuel 528

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment read a third time; and passed.

Extradition Bill [Lords].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Claude Hay 529
Sir E. Carson 530
Lord Balcarres 530
Mr. T. M. Healy 530
Lord Turnour 531
Mr. Herbert Samuel 532

Question, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill," put and agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed without Amendment.

REVENUE [EXCISE DUTY, &c.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That there be charged, as from the sixth day of July, nineteen hundred and six, on a licence to be taken out annually by a manufacturer for sale of British wines, an excise duty of one pound.

2. Resolved, that a uniform duty of ten shillings be substituted for the stamp duties now chargeable on an Award in England or Ireland, and on an Award or Decreet Arbitral in Scotland.

3. Resolved, That it is expedient that the amount payable out of the Consolidated Fund under section three of The Bank Act, 1892, shall, as regards Treasury Bills, be at the rate of two hundred pounds for every million pounds of the maximum amount of Bills outstanding at any one time during the financial year, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other purposes connected with Finance.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow 531

Navy and Army Expenditure, 1904–5.—Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon Navy and Army Grants for 1904–5, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to the Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year—(*Mr. McKenna*)—upon Monday next.

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented on the 19th day of February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. McKenna.*) 532

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July.

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 20th JULY, 1906.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:

1. Indian Railways Act Amendment.
2. Education of Defective Children (Scotland).
3. Reserve Forces.
4. Municipal Corporations.
5. Wireless Telegraphy.
6. Forfar Corporation Water Order Confirmation.
7. Land Drainage Provisional Order.
8. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1).
9. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2).
10. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).
11. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4).
12. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5).
13. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6)
14. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7).

July 20.] *Page*

15. Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law).
16. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).
17. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3).
18. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5).
19. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6).
20. Sea Fisheries Provisional Order.
21. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1).
22. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2).
23. Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3).
24. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, &c.).
25. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, &c.).
26. Maryport Harbour.
27. Southampton Gas.
28. Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions).
29. Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.
30. Channel Ferry Railway and Quay.
31. Hull Joint Dock.
32. Crellin's Patents.
33. Rugby Lower School.
34. Haslingden Corporation.
35. North and South Shields Electric Railway.
36. Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting.)
37. Barry Railway.
38. Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas.
39. Cambrian Railways.
40. Metropolitan District Railway.
41. Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.
42. Trent Navigation Company.
43. Merthyr Tydfil Gas.
44. Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway.
45. Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.
46. Clacton Urban District Council.
47. Newport Harbour Commissioners.
48. Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).
49. Sheffield District Railway.
50. Kettering Water.

July 20.] *Page*

51. Bury Corporation.
52. South Suburban Gas.
53. Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).
54. Manchester Churches.
55. Penllwyn Railway and Road.
56. Metropolitan Railway.
57. Dover Corporation.
58. London and North Western Railway.
59. Dowlais Gas.
60. Epsom and Ewell Gas.
61. Waterford Corporation and Bridge.
62. Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways
63. Newtownards Urban District Council.
64. Midland Railway.
65. Uxbridge Gas.
66. Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway.
67. Scottish Union and National Insurance Company.
68. Cheltenham Gas.
69. Huddersfield Corporation.
70. London and South Western Railway
71. London County Buildings.
72. Metropolitan Water Board.
73. North East London Railway.
74. Peterborough Gas.
75. Cardiff Gas.
76. Manchester Corporation.
77. Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.
78. Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.
79. Glamorgan and South Wales Water.
80. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.
81. Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.
82. Newport Corporation 533

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 553

July 20.] Page

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—Reported with Amendments .. 535

North West London Railway Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments 535

Bristol Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 535

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]—Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to 535

Great Northern Railway Bill; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill. Read 3ª, and passed 535

Rochester, Chatham and Strood Gas Bill; Bacup Corporation Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 536

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 536

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 536

Ascot District Gas Electric Lighting) Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 536

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 169.) 536

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11 Bill); London Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 536

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next 536

Local Government Provisional Orders (No 10) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 536

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Lyveden be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Castlemaine; read, and agreed to 536

PETITIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA.—Petition for extension of franchise to coloured British Subjects in South Africa; of members of the African Political Organisation signing.—Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 537

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 3675, Japan: Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 537

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Orders made by the following borough councils, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the respective boroughs: Wigan; Stockton-on-Tees; Royal Leamington Spa.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 537

Open Spaces Bill (No. 167); Marriage with Foreigners Bill (No. 168).—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and to be printed 537

Extradition Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 537

Ground Game Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 537

The Education Bill.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 537
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 537

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Order of the day read for the consideration of the Commons' Amendments.

The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 538

Moved, "That the Commons Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

MOTOR OMNIBUSES.

The Marquess of Granby 539
Lord Teynham 544
Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 545
Lord Ellenborough 551
Earl Beauchamp 551
Earl Cawdor 552

EMPLOYMENT OF EX-SEAMEN.

Lord Muskerry 553
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 556

July 20.] *Page*

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) COMMISSION.

Lord Reay 558
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Elgin*) 559

House adjourned at Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 20TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills. (See page 533) 562

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—London Squares and Enclosure Bill [Lords]; Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords]. Ordered. That the Bills be read a second time 562

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to. 562

London United Tramways Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; Watford Gas Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 562

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [LORDS] (King's consent signified). Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments 563

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 563

Portsmouth Water Bill [LORDS]; Ritz Hotel Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway (Extension of time) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments 563

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 563

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS]; Electric Lighting Provisionl Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 563

July 20.] Page

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I.).—Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I. of Private Bills; That at the meeting of the Committee a communication was received from Mr. Henry, one of the members of the said Committee, stating that he was unable, on account of his being summoned to take part in legal proceedings at Shrewsbury, to attend the Committee that day.

Report to lie upon the Table 563

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill, Edinburgh Corporation Bill, with Amendments 563

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Buntingford; Cerrig-y-drudion; Gedling (two); Long Ashton; Longgrove; and Newcastle-on-Tyne; to lie upon the Table 563

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Two petitions from Reading, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 564

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MALES) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Govan, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 564

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.—Petition from Islington, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 564

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL [LORDS].—Petitions from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 564

PLURAL VOTING BILL.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 564

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petitions from Gainsborough (two); for alteration; to lie upon the Table 564

SHOPS BILL.—Petitions from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 564

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 565

LAND REGISTRY.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered April 11th; *Mr. Rowlands*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.] 565

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 16th; *Mr. Dillon*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.] 565

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CUSTOMS' NON-PENSIONER WATCHERS.—Question, Mr. Masterman (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 565

July 20.] Page

POLICE AND TIME CRIBBING IN LANCASHIRE.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancs., Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 565

ANNUAL LEAVE OF CLERKS TO SURVEYORS OF TAXES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 567

CLERKS TO SURVEYORS OF TAXES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. McKenna 568

VIVISECTION EXPERIMENTS AT THE GORDON COLLEGE, KHARTOUM.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 569

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) Answer, Mr. Birrell 569

PAY ON LEAVE OF INDIAN CIVIL SERVANTS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Morley 569

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Patrick O'Brien; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Haviland Burke.

Report to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Order for Committee read.

The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs*) 570

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on East India Revenue Accounts.)"

Earl Percy (*Kensington, S.*) 590
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 594
Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 598

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'in view of the responsibility of Parliament in reference to the Government of India, and in order to provide for a more effective control over Indian questions, it is expedient to place the salary of the Secretary of State for India on the Estimates'—(*Mr. Keir Hardie*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Henniker Heaton (*Canterbury*) 600
Mr. Rees (*Montgomory Boroughs*) 602
Mr. J. M. Robertson (*Northumberland, Tyneside*) 608
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) 610

Question put.

July 20.] Page

The House dividied :—Ayes, 153 ; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 242).

Main Question again proposed, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Sir C. Schwann (*Manchester, N.*) 619
Sir W. Evans Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 622
Sir H. Cotton (*Nottingham, E.*) 628
Mr. O'Grady (*Leeds. E.*) 633

Mr. SECRETARY MORLEY rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question, " That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. BILSON (Staffordshire, W.), in the Chair].

Resolved, That it appears from the Accounts presented to Parliament that in 1904–5 the Revenue of India amounted to £84,812,971, the Expenditure charged against Revenue to £81,356,905, and the Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue to £6,258,195.—(*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

Resolution to be reported.

Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill.—Bill was read a second time, and committed for Monday next 638

REVENUE (EXCISE DUTY, ETC).

Resolutions reported—

1. " That there be charged, as from the sixth day of July, nineteen hundred and six, on a licence to be taken out annually by a manufacturer for sale of British wines, an excise duty of one pound."

2. " That a uniform duty of ten shillings be substituted for the stamp duties now chargeable on an award in England or Ireland, and on an Award or Decreet Arbitral in Scotland."

3. " That it is expedient that the amount payable out of the Consolidated Fund under section three of the Bank Act, 1892, shall, as regards Treasury Bills, be at the rate of two hundred pounds for every million pounds of the maximum amount of Bills outstanding at any one time during the financial year, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other purposes connected with Finance."

Resolutions agreed to 638

Dean Forest (Re-Committed) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment (King's Consent signified) ; Bill read the third time, and passed 638

July 20.] *Page*

Land Tax Commissioners Bill.—

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time.

Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 639
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flintshire*) 639

Bill read a second time, and committed for Tuesday, October 23rd.

Ordered, That the Members for Counties do prepare lists of the Christian and Surnames of Commissioners for executing the Land Tax Acts for their respective Counties.

Ordered, that Members for Boroughs and Places having Commissioners exercising exclusive jurisdiction within the same under the said Acts do prepare similar lists of Commissioners for executing the said Acts within such Boroughs and Places respectively.

Ordered, That Members for other Boroughs and Places do prepare similar lists of Commissioners for executing the said Acts for the Counties in which such last-mentioned Boroughs and Places are situate—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July.

Adjourned at two minutes after Seven o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 23RD JULY, 1906.

The Right Hon. George John Shaw-Lefevre, having been created Baron Eversley of Old Ford, in the county of London—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Right Hon. William James Pirrie, having been created Baron Pirrie of the City of Belfast—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir John Jones Jenkins, Knight, having been created Baron Glantawe of Swansea, in the county of Glamorgan—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

George Armitstead, Esquire, having been created Baron Armitstead of Castle hill, in the City of Dundee—Was (in the usual manner) introduced 641

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Post Office Sites.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 641

July 23.] *Page*

Todmorden Corporation Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 641

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 641

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 641

Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill; DERBY GAS BILL.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 641

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 642

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments .. 642

Portsmouth Water Bill [H.L.]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 642

London County Council (General Powers) Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; Watford Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 642

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 642

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 642

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 642

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION.—Petition to be allowed to continue to give Church of England teaching in schools; of teachers in non-provided schools in Framland, Peterboro; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 642

EDUCATION.—Petition against the abolition of the voluntary school system; of inhabitants of Kirkham, Lancaster; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 642

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.—Further correspondence relating to native disturbances in Natal (in continuation of [Cd. 2905.], May, 1906) 643

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Further correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony (in continuation of [Cd. 2563.] July, 1905) 643

July 23.] *Page*

British Guiana.—Further correspondence relating to disturbances in British Guiana (in continuation of [Cd. 2822.], March, 1906) 643

Trade Reports : Annual Series.—

No. 3676. France (French Budget for 1906).
No. 3677. Zanzibar.
No. 3678. Colombia (Barranquilla). 643

Houses of Parliament (Frescoes).—Further memoranda by Professor Church, F.R.S., concerning the wall paintings in the Palace of Westminster .. 643

Royal University of Ireland.—Royal Warrant bearing date September 16th, 1905, amending the Statutes ; Royal Warrant bearing date June 6th, 1906, amending the Statutes 643

Education (Scotland).—Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated July 19th, 1906, providing for special grants in aid of certain school boards in Scotland 643

Motor Cars (Royal Commission).—Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars. Vol. 1. Report. Vol. II. Minutes of evidence, with appendices and index.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table 643

Dean Forest Bill.—Read 1ª. and to be printed. (No. 170.) 643

Capture of Merchant Ships in War Time

Lord Ellenborough 643
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 647

Alkali, etc., Works Bill.

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

" Moved, " That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

Lord James of Hereford 649
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 649

On Question, Bill read 3ª and passed.

Congested Districts Board.

Lord Clonbrock 649
The Marquess of Londonderry 653
Lord Oranmore and Browne 657
Lord Denman 659
Lord Ashbourne 661
The Earl of Mayo 662
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 664
The Marquess of Lansdowne 668

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 23rd JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 670

Cardiff Railway Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 670

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [LORDS].—To be read the third time to-morrow 671

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments 671

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [LORDS] (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments .. 671

Crediton Gas Bill [LORDS]; Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. 671

Kent Electric Power Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 671

Truro Gas Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 671

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 671

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to. 671

Nettlebed and District Commons Bill [LORDS]; Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 671

South Eastern and London and Chatham Railway Bill.

Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 671

Bill, as amended, considered; to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill, without Amendment.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill; Bacup Corporation Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords].

July 23.] *Page*

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment 672

PETITIONS.

Education England and Wales Bill.—Petition from Leicester, against; to lie upon the Table 672

South Africa (Constitutions of Transvaal and the Orange River Colonies).—Petition from Cape Colony, for enfranchisement of the coloured races; to lie upon the Table 674

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 672

Natal.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Native Disturbances in Natal [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 673

British Guiana.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Disturbances in British Guiana [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 673

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3676 to 3678 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 673

Motor Cars (Royal Commission).—Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars, Vol. I., Report. Vol. II., Minutes of Evidence, with Appendices and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 673

Education (Scotland).—Copy presented, of Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated July 19th, 1906, providing for Special Grants in aid of certain School Boards in Scotland [by Command]: ; to lie upon the Table 673

Royal University of Ireland.—Copies presented, of Royal Warrants, dated September 16th, 1905, and June 6th, 1906, amending the Statutes of the University [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 673

Revenue and Expenditure (England, Scotland and Ireland.)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 3rd; Mr. John O'Connor]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.] 673

Houses of Parliament (Frescoes).—Coyy presented of Further Memoranda by Professor Church, F.R.S., concerning the Wall Paintings in the Palace of Westminster [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 673

Trustee Savings Banks.—Return ordered, "(1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th Day of November, 1905; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to Depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to Depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer at the 20th day of November, 1905; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on the 20th day of November, 1905; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of Depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks as well as the number and amount of Depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositor's balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom: and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1905, showing the total number of Depositors in Trustee Savings Banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 275, of Session 1905)."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*) 674

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

OVERTIME AND SUNDAY DUTY IN LONDON TELEPHONE DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 675

LONDON POSTMEN AND COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Wiles (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 676

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT—BY-LAWS FOR THE COUNTY OF LONDON.—Question, Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 677

DELAY IN TELEGRAPHING MR. HALDANE'S SPEECH TO NORWICH.—Question, Mr. Tillett (Norwich); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 677

COMMISSIONERS FOR PUBLISHING THE ANCIENT LAWS OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 678

TRANSLATION OF ANCIENT LAWS OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 678

DISCHARGES FROM WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Haldane 680

July 23.] Page

TAXING OF MOTOR CARS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Asquith 683

REPRESENTATION OF THE CENTRAL PROVINCES ON THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF INDIA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. 683

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND SERVICES FOR ROYAL SCOTS REGIMENT AT BOMBAY.—Question, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answer, Mr. Morley 683

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION—TWO TEACHER SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 684

IRISH EDUCATION CODE RULE 127 (*b*).—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Bryce 684

SALE OF THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN'S ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Bryce 684

APPOINTMENT OF MR. VEREKER TO CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.—Question, Mr. John O'Donnell (Mayo, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 685

IRISH EDUCATION—SECURITY OF TENURE OF PROTESTANT TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 687

DUBLIN CORPORATION—CHARGES OF CORRUPTION.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 687

SHOOTING OF FOWLS BY MAJOR O'CONNOR AT DOUGLAS, COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 688

TOBACCO CULTIVATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 688

EVICTED TENANTS ON MAJOR CHEARNLEY'S ESTATE, COUNTY WATERFORD.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 689

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' EXAMINATION—PUBLICATION OF MARKS OBTAINED.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Bryce 689

IRISH SCHOOL INSPECTORS—INTIMATION TO MANAGERS OF INTENDED VISITS.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 690

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF MR. PETER M'TAGGART ON THE SANKEY ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 690

REINSTATEMENT OF MRS. ELLEN REILLY ON THE LLOYD ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy); Answer, Mr. Bryce 691

EXTRA POLICE AT DRUMKEERIN AND DOWRA, COUNTY LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 691

SALE OF THE GOOLD VERSEHOYLE ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce.. 692

SALE OF THE CUSACK ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 692

July 23.] *Page*

SALE OF THE CLONFIN ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 693

REPORT ON THE POOR LAW COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 693

REPORT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 694

GOVERNMENT GRANT TO UNEMPLOYED—EQUIVALENT GRANT TO IRELAND.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, Mr. Bryce 694

12TH OF JULY CELEBRATIONS IN ULSTER.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 694

GRIEVANCES OF SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS WHO SERVED DURING SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Burghs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 695

NEW ARMY SCHEME—INFANTRY SOLDIERS PASSING ANNUALLY INTO THE RESERVE.—Question, Colonel Long (Worcestershire, Evesham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 695

ARTILLERY GUNNERS AND DRIVERS PASSING ANNUALLY INTO THE RESERVE.—Question, Colonel Long; Answer Mr. Haldane 695

SOUTH EAST OF SCOTLAND MILITIA ARTILLERY AND FIFE ARTILLERY—TAKING OVER OF EQUIPMENT.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 696

SUGGESTED INCREASE OF ARMY PENSION FOR THOMAS LOUGHLIN, LATE 55TH REGIMENT.—Question, Mr. James O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 696

INCREASED IMPORTS OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS INTO THE SOUDAN.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 697

THE CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE AND NAVAL MANŒUVRES TELEGRAMS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 697

DELIVERY OF LETTERS FROM THURSO TO TONGUE.—Question, Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 698

POSTAL DELIVERIES OF LETTERS AT CURAHEEN, NEAR NEVAGA.—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 698

HOUSING QUESTION—COMPULSORY REGISTRATION OF TITLE.—Question, Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham); Answer, Sir John Walton 699

SENTENCES OF IMPRISONMENT ON MALES OVER TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF AGE.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 699

TWICKENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL AND RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION OF TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 700

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—LOAN OF WORKS OF ART.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyne); Answer, Mr. Birrell 700

July 23.] *Page*

Pauper Lunatics Suffering from Effects of Alcohol.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 700

Irish National Education Commissioners.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Bryce 701

Religious Persuasions of Irish National School Inspectors.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 702

Payment of Damages by Constable Cregan.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Bryce 702

Purchase of Captain Caldbeck's Estate—Village of Ballacolla.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Bryce 703

Irish Land Purchase—Receipts by Banks.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Bryce 703

Sale of Belfast Corporation Stock by Representative of Deceased Person.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Bryce 704

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Bermuda Floating Dock.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton, for Mr. Edmund Robertson) 704

Naval Base.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Lambert 705

Royal Arsenal, Woolwich.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) and Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 705

Army Reduction.—Questions, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth), Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central), and Mr. Lea (St. Pancras); Answers, Mr. Haldane 705

Tinned Foods for the Army.—Questions, Mr. Lea; Answers, Mr. Haldane .. 708

Ceylon Duties on Indian Tea.—Questions, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 709

South African Imports of Skimmed Milk.—Question, Mr. Mills (Dorsetshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 709

Gweld Diamond Discovery.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Churchill 710

South African War Claims.—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answers, Mr. Churchill 711

eylon Pearl Fisheries.—Question, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answer, Mr. Churchill 711

July 23.] *Page*

MINERS' PETITION AGAINST COOLIE REPATRIATION.—Questions, Mr. Fiennes (Oxfordshire, Banbury), Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Harborough), Mr. Dewar and Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answers, Mr. Churchill 713

UGANDA.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 713

THE NATAL RISING.—Questions, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.), Mr. Byles (Salford, N.), Mr. Harold Cox (Preston), Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.) and Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Churchill 714

TREATY OF VEREENIGING—DEFINITION OF "NATIVE."—Questions, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Rees and Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 715

TRANSVAAL FRANCHISE.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 716

REPATRIATION NOTICE.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 716

MALTA.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 716

COOLIE DESERTERS.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 717

COOLIE CRIME IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Churchill 717

MORTALITY AMONG BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICAN NATIVES.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Mr. Churchill 717

BEWAARPLATZEN.—Questions, Mr. J. Ramsey Macdonald (Leicester); Answers, Mr. Churchill 718

BISHOP OF ZULULAND'S CHARGES.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 718

RIGHTS OF NATIVES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Churchill 719

REPATRIATION OF COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford); Answer, Mr. Churchill 720

SIR WEST RIDGWAY'S INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, Mr. Churchill 720

LOOTING NATIVE KRAALS.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 720

PASOVA BOUNDARY DISPUTE.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary of the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury, for Sir Edward Grey) 721

SEAMEN'S REMITTANCES.—Questions, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercrombie); Answers, Mr. Runciman 721

TURKISH CUSTOMS DUTIES.—Questions, Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon), Mr. Rees, and Mr. Gooch (Bath); Answers, Mr. Runciman 722

July 23.] *Page*

INCOME TAX.—Questions, Mr. Rose (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 723

INDIAN PENAL CODE.—Question, Sir J. Jardine; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home eepartment, (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 724

MOTOR POWER NOXIOUS ODOURS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 725

MOTOR CAR SPEEDS—CABINET MINISTERS' PRIVILEGE.—Questions, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London), Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 725

LECKHAMPTON HILL RIOTS.—Question, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 726

MOTOR LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 726

LAUNDRIES.—Questions, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 727

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Questions, Mr. Bottomley; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 728

CRUMLIN LEVEL CROSSING.—Question, Colonel Herbert (Monmouthshire, S.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 729

MOTOR BUS SPEED.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 729

TRAINING COLLEGES.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 730

PUPIL TEACHERS' GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 731

WELSH MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury; Answer, Mr. Birrell 732

SCHOOL FEES.—Question, Mr. Fullerton (Cumberland, Egremont); Answer, Mr. Birrell 732

CLAUSE 2 OF THE EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Lord Robert Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 733

THE COUNCIL FOR WALES.—Question, Lord Robert Cecil; Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 733

RATHKEALE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 734

THE RIDGWAY COMMISSION'S REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answers, the Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 734

July 23.] Page

COMMITTEE OF DEFENCE.—Question, Major Seely; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 735

SCOTTISH BILLS.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 736

Irish Tobacco Bill..—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 736

DENSHAWE TRIAL PAPERS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 737

TRAFFIC COMMISSION'S REPORT.—Question, Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 737

SCOTTISH SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 737

TRAWLING LEGISLATION.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty), Mr. Power (Waterford, S.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 738

IRISH REPRESENTATION ON ROYAL COMMISSIONS.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 738

Musical Copyright Bill.—Questions, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 739

IRISH SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 740

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Cumberland (Cockermouth Division), in the room of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, baronet, deceased.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*) .. 740

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, ETC.—Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., have leave to sit to-morrow during the sitting of the House for the consideration of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—(*Mr. Eugene Wason.*) 740

OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS, ETC.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.] 740

NEW BILLS.

Land Tenure (Scotland) Bill.—"To deal with Land Tenure in Scotland," presented by Mr. Munro Ferguson; supported by Mr. Lamont; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 321.] 741

Access to Mountains (Scotland) Bill.—"To secure to the public the right of Access to Mountains and Moorlands in Scotland," presented by Mr. Annan Bryce; supported by Mr. Crombie, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Alexander Black, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Mr. Gulland, Mr. J. M. Henderson, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Dundas White, and Mr. Wilkie; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 322.] 741

July 23.] *Page*

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 741

Motion made and question proposed, "That the Bill be recommitted in respect of Clauses 4 and 25."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 744
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 745
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 748
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 749
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 750
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 752
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 754
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 755
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) 757

Question put, "That this Bill be recommitted in respect of Clauses 4 and 25."

The House divided :—Ayes, 146 ; Noes, 279. (Division List No. 243.)

Lord R. Cecil 763
Viscount Helmsley (Yorks, W.R., Thirsk) 766

New clause :—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in section fourteen of the Education Act, 1870, religious instruction in a public elementary school may include instruction in the tenets and formularies of any religious denomination."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

The Solicitor-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 766
Mr. A. J. Balfour 769
Dr. Macnamara 775
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 777
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 778
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 779
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 780
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) 782
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 783
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 785
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 788

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 114 ; Noes, 254. (Division List No. 244.)

Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 791
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 794

July 23.] *Page*

New clause :—

"Whenever a local education authority in any public elementary school, provided or deemed to be provided by them, allows religious instruction of the character permitted under section fourteen of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, such instruction shall be in accordance with the principles of the Christian faith, as set forth in the Apostles' Creed.' "—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Birrell 795

Question put, and negatived.

Viscount Morpeth (*Birmingham, S.*) 796
Mr. Hicks Beach (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 797

New clause :—

"All public elementary schools shall, when the local education authority are the council of a county, have a body of managers, consisting of a body of managers not exceeding two, appointed by that council, together with a number not exceeding four, appointed by the minor local authority."—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (*Mr. Lough, Islington, W.*) 797

Question put, and negatived.

Viscount Morpeth 798

New clause :—

"When a local education authority provides means of conveyance for a child between its home and a public elementary school, it shall not be a reasonable excuse for the purposes of Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, that there is no public elementary school open which such child can attend within three miles of its residence.—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Lough 798
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (*Leicester*) 799
Mr. Verney (*Bucks., N.*) 799
Mr. Hicks Beach 800

July 23.] *Page*

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 800
Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) 803

New clause :—

" Where the local education authority propose to discontinue any existing voluntary school they shall give public notice of their intention to discontinue such school, and the managers of such school or any ten ratepayers in the area served by such school may, within three months after the notice is given, appeal to the Board of Education on the ground that the said school is required and is better suited to meet the wants of the district than any other school proposed to be provided by the local education authority."—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, " That the clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Birrell 804
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 805
Sir William Anson 807
Sir Philip Magnus (*London University*) 811
Mr. Carlile (*Herts, St. Albans*) 813

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 138 ; Noes, 261. (Division List No. 245.)

Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 819
Dr. Macnamara 822

New clause :—

" On and after the appointed day, the property, powers, rights, and liabilities of the London County Council in relation to education and of the education committee of the London County Council shall be transferred to a new body, to be called the Education Board for London.

" The Education Board for London shall be a body corporate, and shall consist of one member for each electoral division of the administrative county of London (with the exception of the city of London, which shall return two members), elected on the same franchise and for the same period as county councillors, and women shall be eligible for election.

" The first election of the Education Board for London shall take place at the same time as the election of the London County Council in the year one thousand nine hundred and seven, unless the Board of Education shall appoint some other day for such election.

" The ' appointed day ' shall be the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and seven, or such other day, earlier or later, but after the election of the Education Board for London, as the Board of Education may appoint."—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, " That the clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Birrell 826
Sir Edwin Cornwall (*Bethnal Green, N.E.*) 825
Mr. Bridgeman 826

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 26, to leave out the word ' may,' and to insert the words ' appear to.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, " That the word ' may ' stand part of the clause " put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 27, to leave out ' by the authority.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, " That the words ' by the authority ' stand part of the clause,' " put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 27, after the word ' authority,' to insert the words ' subject to the right of the owner of a schoolhouse which is not held under any charitable trust himself to carry out, if he wishes it, any alterations or improvements so required, and to recover from the local education authority any expenses which, in the opinion of the authority, or in case of dispute, in the opinion of the Board of Education, are reasonably incurred for the purpose.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, " That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question, " That further proceedings on consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned "—(*Mr. Birrell*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill [By Order].—Read the third time, and passed. 830

Deanery of Manchester Bill.—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham, in the Chair.]

July 23.] Page

Clause 1 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 831

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again."

Mr. George Whiteley 832

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 49 ; Noes, 307. (Division List No. 246.)

Clauses agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment. Read a third time and passed.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill.—Bill as amended by the Standing Committee considered.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.*) 835

New clause :—

" Every person whom a district council propose to employ as architect, engineer, surveyor, or clerk of works for the purposes of the Labourers Acts shall satisfy the Local Government Board that he has sufficient knowledge and experience for such employment."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be now read a second time."

Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 836
Mr. T. L. Corbett (*Down, N.*) 836

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill.

Mr. O'Shee (*Waterford, W.*) 837

New clause :—

" No limitation as to the area of the parcel of land which may be allotted to an agricultural labourer as defined by the Labourers Acts shall apply in the case of land acquired by a district council by agreement subject to the approval of the Local Government Board."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 838
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 838

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. O'Shee 839
Mr. William O'Brien (*Cork*) 839

New clause :—

"The powers and duties of the Local Government Board shall be exercised by an officer of the Board who shall be described as the Labour Commissioner."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce 840
Mr. J. Redmond 840

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Flynn 841

New clause :—

"In Section 8 of the Act of 1891 which limits the time within which the sanitary authority shall take steps for carrying an improvement scheme into execution 'one month' shall be substituted for 'three months.'"—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce 841

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Kendal O'Brien (*Tipperary, Mid.*) 841
Mr. Sheehan (*Cork Co., Mid.*) 841

New clause :—

"This Act shall apply so far as possible in accordance with the rules and adaptations to be made under the Act to all improvement schemes originated but not completed before the date when this Act comes into operation."—(*Mr. Kendal O'Brien.*)

July 23.] *Page*

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce 842

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.) 842
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 842

New clause :—

"An agricultural labourer who is tenant to a district council of a cottage and plot or of an allotment under the Labourers Acts shall be deemed for purposes of turbary to be an occupier of land on the estate of which the plot or allotment formed part prior to its acquisition by the district council."—(*Mr. Halpin*).

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce 843

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time and added to the Bill.

New clause :—

"The second proviso in Section sixteen of the Act of 1885 shall be and the same is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Lundon.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time," put, and agreed to.

The clause was read a second time and added to the Bill.

Mr. Kendal O'Brien.. 843
Mr. Sheehan 844

New clause to be added—

"The words 'public road' in Section three of the Act of 1886 shall be deemed to include any road or passage over which a public or private right of way exists."—(*Mr. Kendal O'Brien.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

July 23.] Page

The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange*) .. 845
Mr. James Campbell (*Dublin University*) 845
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 846
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin County, S.*) 846
Mr. John Redmond 847
Mr. Bryce 847

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 239 ; Noes, 27. (Division List No. 247.)

Amendment proposed in the proposed new clause—

"To leave out the words down to the word 'over' in line 2 of the clause in order to insert the following words 'notwithstanding anything in Section 3 of the Labourers Ireland Act, 1886, lands for the purpose of this scheme may be selected if they immediately adjoin or are accessible from a road or lane.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. James Campbell 851
Mr. T. M. Healy 851

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

New clause—

"The inspector appointed by the Local Government Board to hold the inquiry as to the propriety of confirming an improvement scheme, or some other person appointed by the Local Government Board, shall, during such inquiry and in the same place, forthwith proceed to decide on the amount of compensation to which he may consider the claimant to be entitled in each case in manner provided by the Second Schedule to The Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and make his award as soon as conveniently may be."—(*Mr. Halpin.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Bryce 852
Mr. J. P. Farrell (*Longford, N.*) 853
Mr. John Redmond 853

Question put and negatived.

Mr. Crean (*Cork, S.E.*) 854

July 23.] Page

New clause—

"That, in order to secure economy and efficiency in the administration of the Labourers Acts, a rural district council may make provision for the erection of any or all of the cottages included in an improvement scheme by their engineer or other qualified officer directly employing skilled workmen at the standard rate of wages prevailing in the district."—(*Mr. Crean.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Question put and negatived.

Mr. Bryce 855

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, after the word 'interested,' to insert the words 'including any agricultural labourers by whom or on whose behalf representations have been made.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Bryce 856

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, to leave out from the word 'schemes' to end of line 32."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause.

Mr. John Redmond 856

Question put, and negatived.

Words omitted.

Mr. Campbell 857

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, to insert, at the end, the words 'Any person interested who has presented a petition which has not been withdrawn may appeal from the decision of the Local Government Board, confirming the order, to the judge of assize for the county in which it is proposed that house accommodation shall be provided for and taken compulsorily. The judge of assize shall hear the appeal and determine all questions arising thereon, and may either confirm the order with or without amendment or disallow the same and may award costs to be paid by or to any of the parties to the appeal. Rules of Court regulating the practice, procedure, and costs, applicable to appeal under this section, and prescribing the time within which an appeal may be brought may be made by the authority having power to make rules of Court for the Supreme Court.' "—(*Mr. Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Bryce 859
Mr. Charles Craig 861
Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (*Fermanagh, W.*) 861
Mr. Walter Long 862
Mr. Cherry 863
Mr. T. M. Healy 864

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 25 ; Noes, 221. (Division List No. 248.)

Mr. Campbell 867

Amendment proposed—

" In page 7, line 30, to leave out ' sub-section (9.). ' "

Question proposed, " That the sub-section proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Bryce 868

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 218 ; Noes, 23. (Division List No. 249.) ..

Mr. Campbell 869

Amendment proposed—

" In page 7, line 41, at end, to insert ' unless the Court shall otherwise order.' "—(*Mr. Campbell.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there added."

Mr. Cherry 871

Question put, and negatived.

Amendments proposed—

" In page 8, line 15, to leave out ' October,' and insert ' March.' "—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

" In page 8, line 16, to leave out ' six,' and insert ' seven.' "—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. John Redmond 871

July 23.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 37, at end, to add—'(2) Where any moneys borrowed before the passing of this Act for the purposes of the Labourers Acts are not repaid at the passing of this Act any rural district council by which such moneys are owing may borrow on the like security such amount as may be required for purpose of paying off such moneys in whole or in part. Advances for the purpose of this sub-section may be made by the Irish Land Commission to a rural district council out of the Irish Land Purchase Fund, as if the same were required for the purchase of land by a tenant from a landlord under the said Act, and all such advances shall be repaid by an annuity in the same manner as if the rural district council to whom such an advance is made were a tenant purchasing land under the said Act.—(*Mr. J. Redmond.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 873

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lonsdale (*Armagh, Mid.*) 874
Mr. Charles Craig 878

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 13, to leave out Clause 18."—(*Mr. Lonsdale.*)

Question proposed, "That Clause 18 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Bryce 878
Mr. T. L. Corbett 879
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 879
Mr. Healy 880
Mr. O'Shaughnessy (*Limerick, W.*) 880
Mr. Sloan (*Belfast, S.*) 881

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 203 ; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 250.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 25, at end, to add the words 'or by a son of any such labourer.'"—(*Mr. William O'Brien.*)

Mr. Bryce 883

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 30, to leave out the word 'advances,' and to insert the words 'an advance.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question, "That the word 'advances' stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

July 23.] *Page*

Proposed words inserted.

Mr. O'Shee 885

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 32, to leave out from the word 'who' to end of clause, and to insert the words 'resides on or in the neighbourhood of the estate.'"—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Cherry 885

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 33, to leave out from the word 'advance' to end of clause, and to insert the words 'resided on the estate or in the neighbourhood thereof. Provided that any pre-existing tenancy under the Labourers Acts of the applicant for the advance shall be determined before the advance is made.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. O'Shee 886

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out from the word 'thereof' to the end of the proposed Amendment."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Words, as amended, inserted in the Bill.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 6, at end, to add 'and the registration shall be made free from all rights and equities referred to in Sub-section 3 of Section 29 of that Act. (2) Where any land, the ownership of which is registered, is conveyed to a district council for the purposes of the Labourers Acts the registration shall be made free from the said rights and equities.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 19, to leave out the words 'in connection with,' and to insert the word 'under.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 22, leave out 'under the said Acts.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

July 23.] Page

"In page 12, line 29, after '1903,' insert 'as amended by this Act.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 30, leave out from 'labourers' to end of clause." —(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Fetherstonhaugh 887

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 12, line 33, to leave out from the word 'Acts,' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'the Lord Chancellor, the Vice-President of the Local Government Board, and the President of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland for the time being, or member of the council of that society to be nominated by the said council, may make rules fixing the amount of fees and providing for the taxation and payment of any costs to be received, allowed, or paid in relation to the confirmation of improvement schemes under the Labourers Acts."—(*Mr. Fetherstonhaugh.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment negatived.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 12, line 34, to leave out the first 'may.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 34, after the word 'things,' to insert the words 'may for the purpose of securing expedition, fix the periods within which inquiries shall be held and improvement schemes dealt with and may.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 36, after the word 'confirmation,' to insert the words 'and carrying into execution.'"—(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. T. L. Corbett 889

Another Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 13, line 24, at the end, to insert the words, "For the purposes of this Act the term 'labourer' will include—(1) Fishermen, whether employed in sailing vessels or in steam trawlers; (2) Artisans who are exclusively employed by farmers or on work on farms."—(*Mr. T. L. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Bryce 889
Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 889
Mr. Sheehan 889
Mr. Ginnell (*Westmeath, N.*) 890

Page

Lord Turnour 890
Mr. O'Shee 890
Mr. Crean 890
Mr. Bryce 890

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 78 ; Noes, 137. (Division List No. 251.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 195 ; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 252.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after Four o'clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF LORDS : TUESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

St. Pancras Electricity Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 897

Hackney Electricity Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 897

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments .. 897

South Lincolnshire Water Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 897

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 897

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 897

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.], Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 897

Cork City Railways and Works Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 897

Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Electric Supply) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 897

July 24.] *Page.*

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 897

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 897

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Leave given to the Select Committee to continue sitting in the absence of the Lord Lyveden 897

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 173.) 898

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 898

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 898

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 898

PETITIONS.

AMBULANCE.—Petition for inquiry as to the desirability of an ambulance service for London; of the Kensington Borough Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 898

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3697. Italy: Supplemental Report of Trade of South Italy for 1905 898

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.—Annual statement of navigation and shipping of the United Kingdom, for the year 1905 898

STATISTICS.—Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1891 to 1905. Fifty-third number.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 898

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.—Account showing the receipt and expenditure of naval prize, bounty, salvage, and other moneys between 1st April, 1905, and 31st March, 1906 899

GENERAL PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.—Order in Council approving of rules made by the general prisons board providing that certain privileges may be earned by convicts through industry and good conduct in prison

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 899

NEW BILLS.

Marriage Act Amendment Bill [H.L].—A Bill for the Amendment of the Marriage Act, 1823, was presented by the Lord Ampthill (for the Viscount Ridley); read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 174.) 899

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments to be considered on Thursday next 899

Deanery of Manchester Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 171.) 899

Labourers (Ireland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Friday next. (*The Lord Denman.*) (No. 172.) 899

THE NEW ARMY SCHEME.

The Earl of Donoughmore 899

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the reductions in the military forces of the Crown now being made and projected, and the changes in organisation consequent thereon."—(The Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*)).

Earl Temple 916
Earl Roberts 919
The Duke of Bedford 931
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) 939
Viscount Hardinge 949
The Earl of Meath 952
The Earl of Denbigh 956
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 966
Lord Newton 975
Viscount Goschen 983
Lord Grimthorpe 986
Lord Ampthill 991
The Earl of Erroll 994
The Marquess of Lansdowne 998
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 1006

On Question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock a.m., to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock

---

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1013

July 24.] *Page*

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Order for Third Reading read and discharged. Bill recommitted to the former Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*) 1013

County of Durham Electric Power Supply (Re-committed) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1013

Private Bills (Group 1).—Mr. Toulmin reported from the Committee on Group 1 of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1013

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to, Alkali, &c., Works Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill, without Amendment. Todmorden Corporation Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill; Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill; Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill; Derby Gas Bill; Cork City Railways and Works Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to, Portsmouth Water Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1013

PETITIONS.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions against; From Bristol; Hoddesdon; Saltash; and, Walberswick; to lie upon the Table 1013

Education (England and Wales) Bill (Religious Teaching).—Petitions against alteration of Law; From Cole Orton (two); Conway; Coulsdon; Croscombe; Cucklington (two); St. Ishmael's; and Wandsworth (two); to lie upon the Table 1014

Land Values Taxation, &c. (Scotland), Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 1014

Local Authorities (Qualification of Women) Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1014

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords].—Two Petitions from Burry Port, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1014

South Africa (Constitution of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies).—Petition from coloured British subjects in South Africa, for enfranchisement of the coloured races; to lie upon the Table 1014

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

General Prisons (Ireland) Act, 1877.—Copy presented, of Order in Council approving of Rules made by the General Prisons Board, providing that certain privileges may be earned by convicts through industry and good conduct in Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1014

July 24.] *Page*

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (UNITED KINGDOM.)—Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1891 to 1905, Fifty-third Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1014

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.—Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1014

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.—Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage, and other Moneys between April 1st, 1905, and March 31st, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 280.] 1014

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3679 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1015

EAST INDIA (BRITISH TROOPS).—Address for "Return of Disease among European Troops in India for the last ten years, showing yearly in reference to each regiment, battery, detachment, etc. (which has been in India for not less than four years), the strength, admissions to hospital per 1,000 for all forms of Disease, admissions to hospital per 1,000 for Contagious Disease, and the stations where such regiments, etc., have been quartered, also showing the annual average ratios for the period covered of all forms of Disease and of Contagious Disease."—(*Mr. Henry J. Wilson.*) 1015

AUDIT OF COUNTY ACCOUNTS (IRELAND) (FEES).—Return ordered, "showing by counties the Fees recovered during the last financial year by the Local Government Board of Ireland from public bodies for auditing Accounts."—(*Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh.*) 1015

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—UNCLAIMED BALANCES.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1015

APPOINTMENT AS SORTING CLERKS OF MESSRS. BICKNELL AND SETTER OF BRISTOL. Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1016

NAVAL WARFARE—RESERVE OF HEAVY GUNS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1016

FOREIGN NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.—Question, Mr. Beauchamp (Suffolk, Lowestoft); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1017

IMPROVEMENT OF ANSTRUTHER HARBOUR—SUGGESTED GOVERNMENT GRANT.—Question, Mr. A. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 1017

CHARGES FOR LONG DISTANCE PRIVATE TELEPHONE WIRES.—Question, Mr. A. Williamson; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1017

IRISH MIDWIVES AND COLONIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1018

TEMPORARY CLERKSHIPS IN DUBLIN GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1019

July 24.] Page

TRANSFER OF CIVIL SERVANTS BETWEEN LONDON, EDINBURGH AND DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1019

IRISH MIDWIVES PRACTISING IN ENGLAND.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1020

APPOINTMENT OF OVERSEERS AT BYKER, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.—Question, Mr. Condon (Tipperary, E.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1021

STATE-AIDED AND PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1021

BOOKS AND APPARATUS FOR DENOMINATIONAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. A. Allen; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1022

WELSH EDUCATION—TRANSFER OF OFFICIALS FROM BOARD OF EDUCATION TO TREASURY.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1022

INCOME TAX ON JOINT STOCK AND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1022

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1023

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1023

SALE OF MISS SOMERS' FARM AT STREAMSTOWN.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1024

SCHOOLS "UNDER TWO TEACHERS."—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1025

FLOODING OF THE RIVER BARROW.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1025

THE ARTILLERY RESERVE.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1026

IRISH MIDWIVES in MILITARY HOSPITALS.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1026

THE MILITIA AND COMPULSORY SERVICE ABROAD.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1027

ARMY BOYS ENLISTED AS TAILORS AND SHOEMAKERS—CONTINUING AT TRADE ON ATTAINING EIGHTEEN YEARS OF AGE.—Question, Mr. A. Allen; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1027

UNEMPLOYED GRANT—PROVISION FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1027

IRISH MIDWIVES.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1028

BUSINESS AT SATURDAY SITTING.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1029

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

HIS MAJESTY'S SHIP "MONTAGU."—Questions, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire), Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham), Mr. Jenkins (Chatham); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1029

THE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF THE ARMY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1030

THE GUARDS.—Questions, Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1030

THE INDENTIFICATION OF BAMBAATA.—Questions, Mr. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth) and Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1030

BRITISH GARRISON IN EGYPT.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1021

ARMY COUNCIL.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent; Answers, Mr. Haldane .. 1031

THE MILITIA.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1032

SPARKBROOK FACTORY.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1032

ORDNANCE FACTORY EMPLOYEES' PRIVILEGES.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1033

RIFLE MANUFACTURE CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1033

POLITICAL AGENTS IN NATIVE STATES OF INDIA.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. John Ellis, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 1034

PEARL SEPARATING MACHINERY.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1034

BRITISH EAST AFRICAN PROTECTORATE CURRENCY.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1035

TRINIDAD LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1035

GAMBLING AND CRIME IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Mond (Chester); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1036

WHITE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Mond; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1036

PORT OF SPAIN BOROUGH COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1036

TRINIDAD FINANCE.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Churchill.. .. 1037

July 24.] Page

THE "KNIGHT COMMANDER."—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affiars (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1037

BAGHDAD RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies; Answer, Sir E. Grey .. 1037

TURKISH CUSTOMS DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon); Answer, Sir E. Grey 1038

CASE OF MR. STANNARD.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Sir E. Grey 1038

FACTORY ACTS—PARTICULARS SECTION.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1039

ACCIDENTS RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1039

VANGUARD 'BUS ODOURS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1040

MOTOR TRAFFIC CASUALTIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1040

DEATH FROM ANTHRAX AT BRADFORD.—Questions, Mr. Jowett (Bradford, W.); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1041

COST OF PAUPER CHILDREN.—Questions, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth Boroughs) and Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answers, Mr. John Burns 1041

IRELAND AND THE UNEMPLOYED RELIEF GRANT.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1042

GRANTS TO DISTRESS COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1042

WHEATHAMPSTEAD SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. H. R. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 1043

SCHOOL EXAMINERS.—Question, Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Lough 1044

LIVERPOOL VICTORIA LEGAL FRIENDLY SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1045

KEW GARDENS WORKERS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1045

SUTHERLANDSHIRE MAIN ROADS.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1045

ISLAND OF LEWIS FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1046

UNEMPLOYMENT COMMITTEES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1046

CRIME IN COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Boyle (Aberdeen, S.) .. 1046

IRISH EXPORTS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1047

AMALGAMATION OF IRISH UNIONS.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1047

COOSCRUM LANDING STAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1048

PORTAILINGTON POLICE BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1048

IRISH POOR LAW COMMISSION REPORT.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1049

POLICE AND THE JOHNSTOWN SCHOOLHOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1049

LONGFORD MAGISTRACY.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Mr. Bryce .. 1049

RIVER DEEL.—Questions, Mr. Flynn; Answers, Mr. McKenna 1051

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL PLANS.—Questions, Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, W); Answers, Mr. McKenna 1052

DRUMLISH LETTER DELIVERIES.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 1053

TINEHALY POST OFFICE MEDICAL OFFICER.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow); Answers, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1053

IRISH TRADE STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. Flynn; Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1054

WELSH DISESTABLISHMENT.—Questions, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthys Tydvil; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1055

HIGH SHERIFFS.—Question, Mr. Ellis Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1055

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments, and with an Amended Title.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 281.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 323] 1057

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1058

July 24.] Page

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out sub-section (2) of Clause 2."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for,' in line 13, stand part of the Bill."

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1059
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1059

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'schoolhouse,' to insert the words 'or permit it to be used either in consideration of a payment or free of charge.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'purposes,' to insert the words 'of public or social utility.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1060

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'not incongruous with the trusts on which the schoolhouse is held.' "—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1061
Mr. Birrell 1061
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 1062

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'public,' to insert the words 'or educational.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1062
Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) 1064

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 2, line 20, at the end, to insert the words, 'If the local education authority refuse to agree to any arrangement offered to them as respects the use of a schoolhouse by the owners thereof, or if the owners of a schoolhouse refuse to agree to any arrangement as respects the use of the schoolhouse offered to them by the local education authority, the owners of the schoolhouse may appeal to the Board of Education to continue the school as a State-aided school, and the Board shall grant the appeal provided that—(*a*) there is in the neighbourhood another school where religious teaching in accordance with Section 14 of the Education Act of 1870 is given; (*b*) that the schoolhouse is structurally suitable for a school; (*c*) that the owners of the schoolhouse are, in the opinion of the Board, in a position to carry on the school as an efficient elementary school with the aid of a Parliamentary grant as hereinafter defined. The Board shall from time to time examine every such State-aided school in order to ascertain whether the buildings are maintained in a sanitary and otherwise suitable condition and whether elementary secular education is being efficiently given. If these conditions are found to be satisfied the Board shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, pay to that school, although it is not a school provided by the local education authority, the Parliamentary grants which would be payable in respect of the school or the scholars in the school if it was a school so provided.' "—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 1065
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 1066
Mr. Birrell 1068
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1070
Sir Thomas Esmonde (*Wexford*) 1072
Mr. J. W. Wilson (*Worcestershire, N.*) 1074
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 1074
Mr. C. B. Harmsworth (*Worcestershire, Droitwich*) 1079
Sir William Anson 1079
Mr. Adkins (*Lancashire, Middleton*) 1081
Viscount Morpeth (*Birmingham, S.*) 1082

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 318. (Division List No. 253.)

Lord R. Cecil 1087

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 2, line 33, after the word 'if,' to insert the words 'required by the owners or trustees.' "—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Birrell 1089
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 1090
Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) 1091
Mr. Birrell 1092

July 24.] Page

Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) .. 1093
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) .. 1093
Mr. Birrell .. 1094

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 93 ; Noes, 359. (Division List No. 254.)

Mr. Evelyn Cecil .. 1097

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 2, line 33, to leave out the words 'under this section.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell .. 1099
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1100
Mr. Birrell .. 1101
Lord R. Cecil .. 1101

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cave .. 1102

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 3, line 2, to leave out the words 'not more than.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Birrell .. 1003
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) .. 1103
Mr. Laurence Hardy .. 1104
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) .. 1104
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) .. 1104

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 272 ; Noes, 114. (Division List No. 255.)

Mr. Lough .. 1107

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 3, line 3, at end, to insert the words 'and the mornings fixed by the local education authority shall be the same mornings in the week for all those children, unless the authority on account of the accommodation in the school, or the number of classes in the school, consider that the instruction cannot be efficiently given on the same mornings to all the children whose parents wish them to receive it.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Lord Balcarres 1109
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) 1110
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 1111
Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.) 1111
Mr. Birrell 1111
Sir William Anson 1112
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 1113
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) 1113

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'or the teachers available.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Mr. Birrell 1114
Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) 1114
Lord Balcarres 1115
Mr. R. Pearce (Staffordshire, Leek) 1115
Lord R. Cecil 1116
Mr. Birrell 1118
Mr. Butcher 1118

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 108 ; Noes, 245. (Division List No. 256.)

Mr. Rawlinson 1123

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, after the word 'classes,' to insert the words 'or children.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lough 1123
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1124
Mr. Lane-Fox 1124

Question put, and negatived.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1124

Main Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 318 ; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 257.)

Lord Balcarres 1127

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 4, to leave out the word 'giving.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 1129
Sir William Anson 1130
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1130
Dr. Macnamara 1131
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 1131
Sir W. Robson 1132
Mr. Evelyn Cecil 1133
Viscount Helmsley (*Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk*) 1133
Mr. Cave 1134
Mr. Birrell 1134

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson 1134

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 6, at the end, to insert the words, 'If any question arises as to the facilities afforded under this section for the giving of religious instruction of a special character such question may be determined by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 1135
Sir William Anson 1137
Mr. Hedges (*Kent, Tonbridge*) 1137
Mr. Birrell 1138

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 139; Noes, 313. (Division List No. 258.)

Motion made, and Question, "That further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Birrell*) put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered to-morrow.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned," (*Mr. Lamont.*)

Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 1143
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1146
Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London) 1146
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 1147
Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich) 1148
Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) 1149
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 1149
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1149
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1150
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 1150

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 276 ; Noes, 65. (Division List No. 259.)

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Dogs Bill.—As amended (by the standing Committee) considered.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1155

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out the words 'to any cattle.' "—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1155
Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.) 1157
Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London) 1157
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 1157

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1158

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 1."—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1158
Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh Districts) 1159
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 1159
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1159
Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.) 1160
Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing) 1161
Mr. William Rutherford 1161

July 24.] Page

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet) 1161

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 2, after the word 'swine' to insert the words 'dogs, turkeys, chickens, ducks, and geese.'"—(*Mr. H. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1162
Mr. Claude Hay 1162
Viscount Turnour 1162
Viscount Helmsley 1162

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 31 ; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 260.)

Sir Frederick Banbury 1165

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 3, to leave out the words 'chased or.'"— (*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'chased or' stand part of the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1165
Viscount Turnour 1166
Mr. Laurence Hardy 1166

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) 1166
Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) 1167

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'thereto' to insert the words 'Provided always that in Ireland it shall be lawful for the owner of a dog to have his name and address inscribed on the collar in Irish characters.'"—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1167
Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.) 1168
Mr. Crean 1168
Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.) 1168
Mr. Winfrey (Norfolk, S.W.) 1169
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 1169
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 1170
Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon) 1171
Viscount Turnour 1171
Mr. Boland 1172
Mr. Claude Hay 1172

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Frederick Banbury 1173
Mr. O'Mara 1173

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 31, to leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'fourteen.'—(*Sir Frederick Banbury*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 1173

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'destroyed' to insert the words 'in a manner to cause as little pain as possible."—(*Mr. Thornton.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, after the word 'shilling' to insert the words 'Every home to which dogs are taken by the police shall be required to keep a register giving a brief description of each dog received, the name of the police station from which it was received, with the date, and the manner in which it has been disposed of. Every such register shall be open to inspection by any member of the public on payment of one shilling.'"—(*Mr. Weir.*)

Question, "That those words be therein inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 2, at beginning to insert 'but such consent shall not be withheld if the court is of opinion that the conditions for exemption mentioned in the said section are duly complied with on the part of the applicant.'"—(*Mr. Cathcart Wason.*)

Question, "That those words be therein inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 10, at end, add, '(3) No fee shall be payable in respect of any application or consent under this section.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Starkey (*Nottinghamshire, Newark*) 1174

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 12, to leave out the words 'a sheep' and insert the words 'any cattle.'"—(*Mr. Starkey.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 14, to leave out the word 'summary.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question, "That the word 'summary' stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 14, after the word 'conviction,' to insert the words 'under the Summary Jurisdiction Act.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted," put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 24, at end, to add the words, '(d) Until the first day of January nineteen hundred and twelve section five shall not apply to any application for the renewal of a certificate of exemption in force at the date of the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Crombie.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Crown Lands (Re-committed) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered to-morrow 1176

PUBLIC TRUSTEES [EXPENSES].—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the Consolidated Fund of such sums as may be required to make good any liabilities incurred by the Public Trustee, or his officers, appointed under any Act of the present session to provide for the appointment of a Public Trustee, and to authorise the payments, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of the salaries or remuneration of the Public Trustee and his officers, and of other expenses incurred by them in pursuance of such Act."

Resolution agreed to 1176

Infectious Disease (Ireland) Bill.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1176
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 1176

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered

Bill read the third time, and passed 1176

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House on the 13th July.

House adjourned at twenty-six minutes before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 25th JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments 1177

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords]; London Squares and Enclosures Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1177

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Newburgh and North Fife Railway, presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered (under Section 7 of the Act) to be considered To-morrow 1177

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways [Lords] Bill.—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1177

PETITIONS.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions against; From Bradbourne; New Ferry; St. George, Wigan; Tytherington; and, West Stockwith; to lie upon the Table 1177

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petition from Borrowash, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1177

July 25.] Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CYPRUS.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 19th; *Sir Carne Rasch*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 282.] 1178

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (CONTRACTS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered May 18th; *Sir Howard Vincent*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 283.] 1178

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1904–5, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1904–5 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1178

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No, 3680 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1178

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended June 30th, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1178

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Ireland, for the year ended March 31st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1178

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Royal University of Ireland. Copy of Account of Receipts and Expenditure of the Royal University of Ireland for the year ended March 31st, 1906, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 284.] 1178

MIDWIVES.—Address for " Return showing the names of Institutions approved as Training Schools for Midwives by the Central Midwives Board and the number of Midwifery cases treated by each during the twelve months previous to the Board's approval

Name of Institution.	Number of Cases.	
	Intern.	Extern.

—*Mr. Helme* 1179

SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES (GOVERNMENT GRANTS) —Return ordered, " showing all the Government Grants during the last fifty years towards establishing, endowing, and maintaining the various Scientific Societies in (1) England, (2) Scotland and (3) Ireland.—(*Mr. Gulland*) 1179

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CROFTER'S COMMISSION—ARBITRATOR'S FEES.—Question, Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1179

PROTECTION OF BRITISH FISHERMEN FROM FOREIGN TRAWLERS.—Question, Sir John Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1179

HOLIDAYS AND PENSIONS FOR SUB-POSTMASTERS.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1181

PIER ACCOMMODATION AT REENARD.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1181

REDUCTION OF PAT M'GOVERN'S HOLDING.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1182

FIRING ON PUBLIC ROADS AT MOYMORE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1182

DELAY IN INSPECTION OF MRS. M. RINKLE'S FARM AT COOLGAVNEY.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1182

DAMAGE TO ROADS BETWEEN TULLYMURRAY STATION AND BALLYKINLAR CAMP BY MILITARY TRAFFIC.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1183

POLICE AND PUBLIC AT ARVA.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1183

ALLOWANCES TO HEAD POSTMEN AT GLASGOW.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1184

TEACHERS' SALARIES—INCREASE FOR LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1184

DEPARTURE OF COLDSTREAM GUARDS FOR EGYPT.—Question, Mr. Gibbs, (Bristol, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1185

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

RETURN OF NAVAL EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1185

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1185

NORTH OF IRELAND YEOMANRY.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. T. S. Corbett (Down, N.), Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.), Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1186

THE PROPOSED ARMY REDUCTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1187

July 25.] *Page*

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, The Under-Secretary for India (Mr. Ellis, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 1188

BRITISH INDIAN TRADERS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury, for Mr. Churchill) 1189

CEYLON TRADE STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer Mr. Runciman 1189

CEYLON FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1190

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF CEYLON.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1190

RUSSIA AND THE ALAND ISLANDS.—Question, Mr. Gibbs (Bristol, W.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1190

MOROCCO.—Question, Mr. Gibbs; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1191

LUNACY COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1191

LECKHAMPTON HILL RIOTERS—Question, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester); Answers, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1191

"PHARAOH'S SERPENTS'" EGGS.—Question, Mr. Richardson (Nottingham, S.); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1192

LONDON TUBE RAILWAYS PROTECTION AGAINST FIRE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1192

COMPANY RETURNS.—Questions, Mr. Barran (Leeds, N.); Answers, Mr. Kearley 1193

WATER SUPPLIES.—Questions, Mr. Maclean (Bath); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1194

WESTBOURNE PARK CHAPEL, PADDINGTON.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, W.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1195

EDUCATION CODE.—Questions, Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1195

MIGRATION FROM LEWIS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1196

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND AND THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 1197

BARRA COTTARS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1197

July 25.]

Page

FOREIGN TRAWLERS.—Questions, Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire), Sir George Doughty (Great Grimsby); Answers, Mr. Sinclair 1197

MORAY FIRTH TRAWLING CASE.—Question, Mr. Lamont (Buteshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1198

MARYBOROUGH ASSIZES.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 1198

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PEACE PRESERVATION ACT IN QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Questions, Mr. Meehan and Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1199

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1200

EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY CAVAN.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answers, Mr. Bryce 1200

IRISH FARMERS' SERVANTS AND LABOURERS COTTAGES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1201

IRISH TENANTS IMPROVEMENT LOANS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1202

CAVAN MAGISTRACY.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Bryce 1203

UNTENANTED LAND IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1204

COLONEL MALONE'S BARONSTOWN ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell; Answers, Mr. Bryce 1204

ROSCREA WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1204

SHANNON DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1205

ROSCREA SANITATION.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1206

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1206

MACONELY ESTATE—TENANTS' TURBARY RIGHTS.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1207

SALE OF THE MACONELY ESTATE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1208

LAMPHIER ESTATE, COUNTY TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1208

SALE OF MR. COURTENAY CROKER'S MOOHANE ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1209

IRISH QUESTIONS.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answers, Mr. Bryce .. 1210

CORPORATION OF DUBLIN CLERKSHIPS.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1211

MR. T. RORKE, J.P.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce .. .. 121[illegible]

ALLEGED LAWLESSNESS IN GALWAY.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1212

RETURN OF GOVERNMENT CIVIL SERVANTS IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. Bryce 1213

ACTION AGAINST SERGEANT DOBSON ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.— Questions, Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Bryce 1215

COMMISSION ON LAND CONGESTION.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1216

LORD SOUTHWELL'S BALLINGRANE LIMERICK ESTATE.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1216

ARVA EVICTION.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1216

MAGISTRATE'S APPOINTMENT FEES.—Questions, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.), Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) 1217

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND AND DEAF.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1218

CAVAN POSTAL SERVICE.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy and Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1218

RATHKEALE POST OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1219

ROSCREA CASTLES.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answers, Mr. McKenna 1219

NORTH SEA FISHERY INVESTIGATIONS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1220

THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE DUMA.—Questions, Lord Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1220

Justices of the Peace (No. 2) Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 326.] 1221

Conveyancing Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time on Tuesday, 23rd October, and to be printed. [Bill 328.] 1221

Married Women's Property Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 23rd October, and to be printed. [Bill 329.] .. 1221

Settled Land Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 23rd October, and to be printed. [Bill 330.] 1221

NEW BILLS.

Railways (Contracts) Bill.—" To amend the Law relating to Railway and Canal Companies' Rates and Conditions of Conveyance," presented by Mr. Hooper; supported by Sir William Holland, Mr. Channing, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. J. W. Wilson, Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Dr. Hazel, and Mr. Hyde; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 24th October, and to be printed. [Bill 324.] 1221

Architects' Registration Bill.—" To provide for the Registration of Architects," presented by Mr. Atherley-Jones; supported by Sir George Fardell, Mr. Hamar Greenwood, Mr. Fenwick, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. John O'Connor, and Mr. Wallace; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 325.] 1221

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 1222
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 1223

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 3, line 7, to leave out the word ' may,' and insert the word ' shall.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' may ' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 1225
Dr. Macnamara, (*Camberwell, N.*) 1225
Sir Thomas Esmonde (*Wexford, N.*) 1226
Mr. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 1226
Mr. Paul (*Northampton*) 1226
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1228
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) .. 1233
Mr. Lyttelton (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 1238
Mr. Adkins (*Lancashire, Middleton*) 1240
Mr. Masterman (*West Ham. N.*) 1242
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 1244
Mr. Verney (*Buckinghamshire, N.*) 1245
Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 1246

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 247 ; Noes, 160. (Division List No. 261).

Mr. Evelyn Cecil (*Aston Manor*) 1251
Sir Francis Powell 1254

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 3, line 10, to leave out the words, ' in an urban area.' "—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

July 25.]

Page
The Solicitor-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 1256
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1258
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R. Barkston Ash) 1259
Mr. Lupton 1261
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 1262
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 1263
Mr. Abel Smith (Hertfordshire, Hertford) 1266
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 1266
Mr. Birrell 1267
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1270

Mr. BIRRELL rose in his place and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question, " That the Question be now put," put and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 245 ; Noes. 118. (Division List No. 262.)

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 16, after the word 'taken' to insert the words previously to the inquiry.' "—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question, " That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 17 and 18, to leave out the words 'regulations made for the purpose by the Board of Education,' and to insert the words 'this section.' "

Question, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Question proposed, " That the words 'this section' be there inserted."

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1275
Mr. Birrell 1275
Dr. Macnamara 1275

Question put, and agreed to.

Lord R. Cecil 1276
Mr. Lane-Fox 1277

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words 'the parents of' and insert the words 'of the parents voting those representing.' "—(*Lord Cecil.*)

Question proposed, " That the words 'the parents of' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Lupton 1277
Mr. Birrell 1278
Lord Balcarres 1279

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 240, Noes, 94. (Division List No. 263.)

Mr. Evelyn Cecil 1263
Mr. Burdett Coutts (Strand, Westminster) 1285

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17, to leave out the words 'at least four-fifths' and insert the words 'a reasonable number.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 1285
Sir William Anson 1285
Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich) 1287
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1289
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) 1289

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 265 ; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 264.)

Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 1293

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 21, to leave out from the word 'that,' to end of line 24, and insert the words 'suitable provision is made for the religious instruction of children attending the school whose parents desire for them facilities for religious instruction of a different character.'"—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir W. Robson 1296
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 1298
Sir William Anson 1298
Sir Thomas Esmonde 1300

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 324 ; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 265.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 23, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'other.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the word 'other' be inserted in the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 23 and 24, to leave out the words 'whose parents do not desire those facilities,' and insert the words 'Provided that a child shall not be reckoned in the number of children for whom accommodation is required if the parent of the child shows at the inquiry that he does not require that accommodation for his child, and that no vote has been given at the ballot in respect of the child.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Sir Henry Craik 1305

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, at the end, to insert the words 'if a vacancy arise in the office of teacher, the local education authority shall, in choosing the teacher, appoint a teacher who is willing to give the religious instruction permitted under this section.'"—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 154; Noes, 332. (Division List No. 266.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions upon the Amendments proposed by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 3, at the end, to insert the words 'An appeal under this section shall not be entertained unless it is made before the first day of January nineteen hundred and eight.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 341; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 267.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 23, to leave out the word 'nine' and insert the word 'ten'"—(*Mr. Birrell*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 330; Noes, 155. (Division List No. 268.)

Amendment made—

"In page 10, line 33, at end, add, 'During the time between the passing of this Act and the first day of January nineteen hundred and eight, the owners of the schoolhouse of an existing voluntary school shall furnish to the local education authority any information which the authority may reasonably require as to the title under which the school is held and in the case of a case of a school held under charitable trusts, as to the nature of the trusts and the contents of the trust deeds (if any).' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 33, at end, add; '(5) No child shall be reckoned, for the purposes of the provisions of this Part of this Act relating to extended facilities and appeals with respect to the mode of giving extended facilities, as a child attending a school unless the child has attended the school with due regularity for at least six months, in accordance with the code of Minutes of the Board of Education for the time being in force in respect to public elementary schools, and if any question arises whether a child has attended a school for the purpose of those provisions,that question shall be decided by the Board of Education."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 382; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 269.)

Amendments made—

"In page 11, lines 9, 10, and 11, to leave out the words 'or duty in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers,' and to insert the words 'to engage, dismiss, or fix the salary of a teacher.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 11, line 11, after the word 'teachers' to insert the words 'or of making arrangements under this Act for the use of the schoolhouses of voluntary schools, or of affording or withdrawing facilities under this Act for the giving of religious instruction of some special character'; in line 13, to leave out the words 'this or'; in page 13, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (10)."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 14, lines 6 and 7, to leave out the words 'with the consent of the Board of Education'; in line 8, after the word 'appropriate,' to insert the words 'with the consent of the Board of Education'; in line 13, after the word 'appropriate,' to insert the words 'with the consent of the Board of Education'; in line 17, at end,to insert the words 'and (iii) appropriate with the consent of the Local Government Board for any of the purposes of the Education Acts any land acquired by them otherwise than in their capacity as local education authority'; in line 18, leave out the word 'either' and insert the word 'any'; in line 24, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'or in the case of land appropriated under this section and not acquired for any of the purposes of the Education Acts, the Local Government Board.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 15, line 14, at end, to insert the words 'or to any joint body established under Section 52 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, or otherwise established by two or more local authorities'; in line 16, after the word 'contrary,' to insert the words 'or any provisions to the contrary which have been approved by the Local Government Board are contained in the scheme or instrument establishing the committee or body'; in line 17, after the word 'committee,' to insert the words ‘ or body ’ ; in line 18, to leave out the words ‘ provisions as to audit,’ and to insert the words ‘ enactments relating to the audit of the accounts of local education authorities ’ ; in line 19, after the word ‘provisions,’ to insert the words ‘ of those enactments.’ ”—(*Mr. Birrell.*

“ In page 16, line 23, after the word ‘Powers,’ to insert the words ‘ and duties ’ ; in line 26, after the word ‘ schools ’ to insert the word ‘vacation’ ; in line 27, leave out ‘in schoolhouses’; in line 29, after ‘ prescribe,’ insert ‘ in the schoolhouse or in some other suitable place in the vicinity, so far as the local education authority in the case of a schoolhouse or place not belonging to them can obtain for the purpose the use of the schoolhouse or place ’ ; line 30, at beginning, insert ‘ the duty to provide for the medical inspection of children before or at the time of their admission to a public elementary school, and on such other occasions as the Board of Education direct, and the.’ ”—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

“ In page 17, to leave out lines 12 to 18, inclusive ; in line 23, at end, to insert ‘ and that provision shall be made by the Order in Council, so far as is practicable, for the representation of minorities in the number of representatives appointed by the council of each county and each county borough, and on any executive committee appointed by the council, in the proportion so far as possible of at least one in three.’ ” —(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment proposed to the Bill, in page 17, line 27, after the word “ to,” to insert the words “ the provisions of this section and to.”—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, “ That the Amendment be made.”

The House divided :—Ayes, 380 ; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 270.)

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 17, line 36, to leave out from beginning of line to the second ‘ The ’ in line 38, and to insert the words ‘ provided that.’ ” —(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, “ That the Amendment be made.”

The House divided :—Ayes, 376 ; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 271.)

Another Amendment made to the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

“ In page 18, line 9, at end, to insert the words, ‘ in the exercise of any powers or in the performance of any duties transferred under this provision, the Council of Wales shall be subject to the control of the Treasury.’ ”—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, “ That the Amendment be made.”

The House divided, Ayes, 366 ; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 272.)

Other Amendments made to the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 18, line 29, at end, to insert the words, 'and if, before the expiration of that time, an Address is presented to His Majesty by both Houses of Parliament against the draft or any part thereof no further proceedings shall be taken thereon without prejudice to the making of any new draft.' "—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 362 ; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 273.)

Other Amendments made to the Bill.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 327.]

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords] (By Order.)—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. W. R. Rea (Scarborough) 1345
Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead) 1348

mendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.' "—(*Mr. Walter Rea.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1350
The Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr. Emmott, Oldham) 1354
Mr. W. H. Davies (Bristol, S.) 1355
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1356
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1356

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1356
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 1357

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 105 ; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 274.)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided :—Ayes, 145 ; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 275.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

July 25.] *Page*

Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 1365
Mr. Stanley Wilson (*Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*) 1364
The Postmaster-General (*Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1365

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

Revenue Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, after the word 'paid,' to insert the words 'to the authorised methylator or to the person by whom the spirits are received, as the case may be.' "—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*).. 1365

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Viscount Turnour.*)

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this clause as amended stand part of the Bill."

Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 1366
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 1366

Questions put and agreed to.

New clause—

> " The provisions of Section 9 of the Finance Act, 1904, shall apply in relation to life insurances or contracts for deferred annuities effected in or with any insurance company lawfully carrying on business in Great Britain or Ireland, and accordingly such section shall be read and construed as though the words ' or lawfully carrying on business in Great Britain or Ireland ' were inserted therein at the end of the fifth line thereof after the words ' British possession.' "—(*Mr. Berridge.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question, " That the clause be read a second time " put and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

Crown Lands Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Claude Hay 1367
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 1368

Bill read a third time and passed.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1368

Dangerous Performances Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1368

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill.—Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, to whom the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill was referred, that they have power to consolidate the said Bills into one Bill.—(*Mr. Lough.*) .. 1368

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 26TH JULY, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Sutton District Water Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1369

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]; Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1369

July 26.] *Page*

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1369

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons. 1369

North West London Railway Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bills passed, and returned to the Commons 1369

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1369

Edinburgh Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1369

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1369

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 1369

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT, No. 3 (1906).—Correspondence respecting the attack on British Officers at Denshawai 1369

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3680. Russia (Taganrog) 1370

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Thirty-fourth Annual Report for the year 1904–1905. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer for 1904–1905 1370

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1906 1370

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Annual Report for the year ended March 1906 1370

PRISONS (IRELAND).—Twenty-eighth Report of the General Prisons Board, Ireland, 1905–1906.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie upon the Table 1370

POST OFFICE (STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1906).—No. 523. The Telegraph (Foreign Written Telegram) Regulations, 1906, dated 16th July, 1906 1370

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Order made by the council of the borough of Nelson, and confirmed with certain Amendments by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain shops within the borough.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table. 1370

July 26.] *Page*

Dogs Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed, and to be read 2ª To-morrow. (*The Earl Carrington.*) (No. 175.) 1370

Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 176.) 1370

Crown Lands Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 177.) 1370

Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed, and to be read 2ª on Monday next (*The Lord Granard* [*E. Granard*].) (No. 178.) 1371

Post Office Sites Bill. [Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 1371

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed for Monday next.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill.—[Second Reading.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 1371

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill [Second Reading.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 1372

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]—Order of the Day read for the consideration of Commons Amendments.

The Earl of Halsbury 1372

Moved, "That the House do agree with the Commons in their Amendments."—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

July 25.] *Page*

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN COUNCIL SCHOOLS.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury .. 1373
The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph .. 1386
Viscount Halifax .. 1389
Lord Burghclere .. 1390
Lord Stanley of Alderley .. 1392
The Lord Bishop of Southwark .. 1395
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) .. 1396

THE WATTS' STATUE "PHYSICAL ENERGY."

The Earl of Plymouth .. 1496
The Lord Steward of the Household (*The Earl of Liverpool*) .. 1407

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till to-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 26TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill.—Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to .. 1408

Crediton Gas Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments .. 1408

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time and passed, with an Amendment .. 1408

Kent Electric Power Bill [LORDS]. (King's Consent signified.)—Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments .. 1408

Truro Gas Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments .. 1408

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time To-morrow .. 1408

Paisley Roads Order Confirmation Bill. — "To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley Roads," presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered (under Section 7 of the Act), to be considered To-morrow .. 1408

Dover Harbour (Works) Bill [LORDS].

The Chairman of Ways and Means, in pursuance of Standing Order 83 relating to Private Bills, informed the House that, in his opinion, the Dover Harbour (Works) Bill [Lords], though unopposed, ought to be treated as an opposed Bill .. 1409

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to: Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill; North West London Railway Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1409

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill.

The Chairman of Committees (*Mr. Emmott, Oldham*) 1409

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Blithfield; Bumpstead (two); Coopersale; Cropwell Bishop; Ilkeston; Sculcoates; and, Worksop; to lie upon the Table. 1409

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law; From Cheam; Shefford (two); and, Stondon Massey; to lie upon the Table 1410

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 1410

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petition from Ealing, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1410

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT (No. 3, 1906).—Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the attack on British Officers at Denshawai [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1410

PRISONS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Twenty-eighth Report of the General Prisons Board (Ireland) for 1905–6 with an Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1410

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Nelson and confirmed, with certain Amendments, by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1410

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT, 1890.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered April 11th; *Mr. Brodie*]; to lie upon the Table 1410

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Acts relating to Sea Fisheries for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1410

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

DUNGANNON NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1411

July 26.] Page

BELFAST POSTMEN AND JULY 12TH.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1411

HAMPSTEAD TELEPHONES.—Question, Lieutenant-Col. Phillips (Southampton), Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1411

ROSYTH.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1412

ELY ESTATE, FERMANAGH.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1412

MR. PETER J. O'MALLEY, J.P.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1412

SCHOOL GRANTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Colonel McCalmont (Antrim, E.); Answer, Sir Thomas Esmonde 1413

LORD GOUGH'S GORT PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1413

KINVARA HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1414

LOUGHREA CARETAKER'S TROUBLE.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1414

COLONEL GASCOIGNE'S KILFINANE PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1415

MR. LOWE'S GALBALLY TENANTRY.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1416

MINSHUN ESTATE, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1416

MOUNTSHANNON ESTATE, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1417

IRISH PRISON GOVERNOR.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1418

IRISH EVICTION DATES.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1419

URLINGFORD DRAINAGE CHARGES.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1419

ALLEGED WRONGFUL DETENTION IN MONAGHAN ASYLUM.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1420

ARKLOW PIER.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1421

MR. BERESFORD'S STRADBALLY PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1422

CAHEROYAN PROPERTY, ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1423

CATHOLICS AND THE DONEGAL GRAND JURY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1423

LAMBERT MINORS' ESTATE, ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1423

TODD THORNTON ESTATE, COUNTY ARMAGH.—Question, Mr. McKillop (Armagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1424

MR. ROBERT BAILEY OF FOWNEY.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1424

WEST KENT REGIMENTAL TAILOR. — Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1425

PIERSHILL BARRACKS, EDINBURGH.—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1425

GUN FIRING AT ROKER.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1426

DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL SITE.—Question, Major Anstruther Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1426

PIERSHILL BARRACKS.—Question, Major Anstruther Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1426

NEW BAYONET.—Question, Major Anstruther Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1426

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1427

MESSRS. ARMSTRONG WHITWORTH & CO. AND THE VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1427

TRADE MARK LAW IN CHINA.—Question, Mr. Tillett (Norwich); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1427

NATAL MUNICIPAL CORPORATION BILL.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1428

VALENTIA SHOOTING LEASE.—Question, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1430

HOUSE OF COMMONS CROCKERY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1430

AGRICULTURAL RATING GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1431

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES.—Question, Major Coates (Lewisham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1431

METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCILS AND PARLIAMENTARY COSTS.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1432

STANSTED TUBERCULOSIS EXPERIMENT FARM.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1432

EDUCATION COMMITTEES AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1433

July 26.] Page

ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES' DOCUMENTS.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1433

NEW END HAMPSTEAD AND ELTHAM SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1434

ORANGE POSTAL OFFICIALS AT LISNALONG.—Question, Mr. McKean (Monaghan, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1434

TELEGRAPHING FIGURES.—Question, Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1435

BELFAST POSTAL STAFF GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1435

BELFAST MAIL VAN DRIVERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1436

BELFAST LETTER DELIVERIES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1436

MAGHERAFELT RURAL POSTMAN.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1436

CLERKS TO SURVEYORS OF TAXES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1437

CUSTOMS HOUSE WATCHER'S WAGES.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1438

CLERKS TO SURVEYORS OF TAXES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1439

BENGAL NEWSPAPER SUBSCRIBERS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Morley 1439

INDIAN GOLD STANDARD RESERVE.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley 1439

JULY CELEBRATIONS AT NORTH FERMANAGH.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1440

DROMORE COTTAGE.—Question, Mr. McKean; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1440

POLICE VISITATION.—Question, Mr. McKean; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1441

APPOINTMENTS OF TORRMEBRIDGE PETTY SESSIONS CLERK.—Question, Mr. McKean; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1441

EARL OF LUCAN'S PONTOON PROPERTY.—Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1442

ARMY SERGEANTS AND PLAIN CLOTHES.—Question, Mr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1443

MILITARY GUARD OF HONOUR AT IRISH ASSIZES.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1443

July 26.] Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

INDIAN LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 1443

TIBET.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Morley 1444

INDIAN COTTON INDUSTRIES.—Questions, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham) and Mr. Harwood (Bolton); Answers, Mr. Morley 1444

SUPERINTENDENT OF FOREIGN LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1445

RELIGIOUS PROCESSIONS IN MALTA.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1445

FEDERATED MALAY STATES—GAMBLING HOUSES.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1447

LOOTING OF LOYAL NATIVES' KRAALS IN NATAL.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1447

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1448

THE RETURN OF THE CHIEF NANA TO SOUTHERN NIGERIA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1448

THE DECAPITATION OF BAMBAATA.—Questions, Mr. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1448

NATIVE LOSSES IN NATAL.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1449

NEW CONSTITUTION FOR THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1450

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR CLAIMS—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside), Answers, Mr. Churchill 1450

RAILWAYS FREIGHT TO WEST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1451

UGANDA—SLEEPING SICKNESS.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1452

RESPONSIBILITY FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS IN NATAL. — Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1452

MOROCCO.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1453

BAHR-EL-GAZEL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 1454

BRUNEI AND THE ANHUI MINING CONTRACTS.—Questions, Sir Edward Sassoon and Sir Charles Dilke; Answers, Sir Edward Grey 1454

July 26.] *Page*

MACEDONIAN BUDGET.—Questions, Mr. Bowles (Norwood) and Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon); Answers, Sir Edward Grey 1455

RUSSIAN TARIFFS.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield); Answers, Sir Edward Grey 1456

HOUSE OF COMMONS POLICE.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1456

VACCINATION FINES AT CHESTER-LE-STREET.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1457

PRISON OFFICERS GRIEVANCES.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answers, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1457

LECKHAMPTON HILL RIOT.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1457

MOTOR ACCIDENTS IN LONDON.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answers, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1450

LUNACY COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1459

SCOTTISH FISH CURING INDUSTRY.—Questions, Mr. Chiozza Money and Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answers, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1459

HOURS OF FLORISTS' ASSOCIATION.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1460

ARCHITECT TO THE BOARD OF LUNACY COMMISSIONERS.—Questions, Dr. Cooper; Answers, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1460

COURT FOR RATING OF RAILWAY APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Bertram (Hertfordshire, Hitchen); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1461

CABINET MINISTERS' TRAFFIC PASSES.—Questions, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham), Mr. Liddell (Down, W.), and Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answers, Mr. Herbert Samuel 1462

STANSTED TUBERCULOSIS EXPERIMENTAL FARM.—Question, Mr. Raphael Derbyshire, S.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1463

TOXTETH RELIEVING OFFICER.—Question, Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1464

FREE EDUCATION.—Question, Sir G. Kekewich (Exeter); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1464

JARROW-ON-TYNE SECONDARY SCHOOL FEES.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1464

TELEGRAPHISTS' SCALE OF WORK.—Questions, Mr. William Rutherford; Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1465

PRESS MESSAGE DELAYS.—Questions, Mr. William Rutherford; Answers, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1466

PROMOTIONS AT LIVERPOOL TELEGRAPH OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. William Rutherford; Answers, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1466

NEW WAR OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Thorne; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Rossendale) 1467

KEW GARDENS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1467

ROYAL SCOTTISH MUSEUM, EDINBURGH.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1468

MINISTRY OF WELSH EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. William Rutherford; Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1468

ZOOLOGICAL AND BOTANICAL GARDENS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire) 1468

LICENCES ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), for Mr. Charles Hobhouse 1469

SCHOOL WATER SUPPLIES IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1470

SHETLAND HERRING FISHERY.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1470

SHETLAND HERRING FISHING AND WHALING OPERATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 1471

UNST SCHOOL BOARD GRANT.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1471

PERTHSHIRE CHIEF CONSTABLE.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The Lord-Advocate (Mr. T. Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 1472

IRISH CANALS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1472

FORESHORE AT NEWCASTLE (COUNTY DOWN).—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. Sloan; Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1472

GORTREGAN POSTAL DELIVERY.—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1472

DUBLIN LAW COURTS.—Question, Sir E. Carson (Dublin University); Answer The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 1474

IRISH PASSENGER TRAINS.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Mooney (Newry), Mr. John Redmond, Viscount Turnour, and Mr. Sloan; Answers, Mr. McKenna 1474

July 26.] *Page*

SCOTTISH BILLS.—Questions, Mr. Morton and Mr. Weir; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1475

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE ACT.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1476

WAGES BOARD BILL.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1476

THE PARTITION OF BENGAL.—Questions, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth) and Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1476

NAVAL BASES.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (King's Lynn); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1477

SCOTTISH PUPIL TEACHERS.—Questions, Mr. Morton; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1478

PUBLIC TRUSTEE BILL.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1478

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Freeman Freeman-Thomas, esquire, for the County of Cornwall (South-Eastern or Bodmin Division) 1479

SUPPLY [18TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.—CLASS II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £38,566, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

Mr. Joyce (Limerick) 1479

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,566, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Joyce.*)

Mr. Farrell (Longford, N.) 1486
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1493
Mr. Cogan (Wicklow, E.) 1494
Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) 1499
Mr. Nolan (Louth, S.) 1501
Sir Thos. Esmonde (Wexford, W.) 1503
Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.) 1504

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.*) 1506
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 1516
Mr. Ginnell (*Westmeath, N.*) 1517

The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 140 ; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 276.)

Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,566 be granted for the said Service," put accordingly, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £14,118, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums."

Mr. Lonsdale (*Armagh, Mid.*) 1521
Colonel Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) 1525

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Lonsdale.*)

Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 1533
Mr. Barrie (*Londonderry, N.*) 1536
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 1538
Mr. Bryce 1541
Mr. Walter Long 1549

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 41 ; Noes, 240. (Division List No. 277.)

Original Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 233 ; Noes, 38. (Division List No. 278.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow ; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

Marine Insurance Bill [Lords].—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 1557

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 6, after the word 'contract,' to insert the words 'of indemnity.' "—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

July 26] *Page*

Question proposed, "That the words 'of indemnity' be there inserted in the Bill."

The Attorney-General (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) 1557

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) 1557

Amendment proposed—

"In page 11, line 11, after the word 'where,' to insert the words 'owing to the gross negligence or.' "—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Amendments, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 39, at end to insert 'though he need not be interested when the insurance is effected.' "

"In page 3, line 2, to leave out 'it is immaterial that."

"In page 3, line 2, after 'may,' to insert 'recover, although he may.' "

"In page 3, line 35, to leave out Sub-sections (2) and (3), and insert 'A mortgagee, consignee, or other person having an interest in the subject matter insured may insure on behalf and for the benefit of other persons interested as well as for his own benefit.' "

"In page 5, line 18, after 'risk,' to insert 'and in particular the fact that a policy is effected by way of re-insurance is material.' "

"In page 8, line 31, at beginning to insert 'Subject to the Provisions of this Act, and.' "

"In page 11, line 3, to leave out from 'equipment' to end of sub-section, and insert 'the warranty in respect of such preparation or equipment is satisfied if at the commencement of each stage the ship is seaworthy in respect of such preparation or equipment for the purposes of that stage.' "—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 15, line 29, to leave out from the words 'specie' to end of sub-section."

"In page 16, line 25, to leave out from the word 'repairs,' to the word 'or,' in line 28, and insert 'no deduction is to be made in respect of general average contributions to those repairs payable by other interests, but deduction is to be made of contributions which would be payable by other interests towards necessary future expenses.' "

"In page 17, line 26, to leave out the words 'thereupon becomes entitled to,' and insert the words 'is entitled to take over.' In page 17, line 29, to leave out sub-section (2); In page 17, line 37, to leave out the words 'abandonment,' and insert the words 'the casualty.'"

"In page 18, line 6, after the word 'against,' to insert the word 'and'; In page 18, line 7, leave out from loss,' to end of sub-section; In page 18, line 11, at beginning, to insert 'Expenses incurred by or on behalf of the assured for the safety or preservation of the ship insured other than general average and salvage charges, are called particular charges.'"

"In page 18, line 13, to leave out from the word 'charges,' to end of sub-section and insert the words 'incurred in preventing a loss by perils insured against may be recovered as a loss by those perils.'"

"In page 18, line 36, to leave out the words 'is liable for a general average contribution or.' In page 19, line 19, after the second 'the' to insert 'rights and.'"

"In page 21, line 7, to leave out sub-section (4)."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 17, to leave out from the word 'case' to end of sub-section."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Ammendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments

Revenue Bill.—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed .. 1560

Justices of the Peace (No. 2) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to. 1560

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of July 13th.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CLXI.

VOLUME CLXI.

ERRATUM.

July 26. In col. 1472, Delete Mr. JOHN REDMOND'S Question and the Reply attached thereto. The Question was postponed to July 30. (See (4) *Debates* clxii, 464.)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SIXTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1906.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 17th July, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Report from the Commitee of Selection, That the Viscount Falmouth be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Castlemaine; read, and agreed to.

Standing Orders Committee—Report from, that the further Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed.

Read, and agreed to.

Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Great Northern Railway Bill. Reported, without Amendments.

Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Hammersmith, City and North East London Railway Bill. Commons Message of the 5th instant considered (according to Order), then it was moved to resolve—

That the promoters of the Bill which has been introduced into the House of Commons during the present session of Parliament, shall have leave to introduce the same in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon, up to that period, be paid.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than Three o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit after the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto, signed by the agent, stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

That the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro formâ* only in regard to every stage through which the same shall have passed in the present session; and that no new fees be charged in regard to such stages.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to the said Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session.—(The Chairman of Committees); agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to acquaint them that the Lords had concurred with them in suspending the said Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; London Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill. House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Poole Corporation Water Bill; Cork City Railways and Works Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Malmesbury be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Castlemaine; read, and agreed to.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [H.L.]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [H.L.]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Cardiff Gas Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—(Barton - upon - Irwell). Order for the consideration of Standing Order No. 93, read, and discharged.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MOTOR CARS (PROSECUTIONS).

Return of all proceedings for offences in connection with the driving of motor cars during the period from July 1st, 1904, to June 30th, 1905. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).

No. 488. Belgium and the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg—Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 19) Warrant 1906; dated June 28th, 1906.

No. 491. British East Africa and the British Central Africa Protectorate—

Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 20) Warrant 1906; dated June 30th, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment. and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

GROUND GAME BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Friday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 159).

TOBACCO GROWING IN IRELAND.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government to state the full particulars of the special facilities and fiscal remissions granted by the late Government for the encouragement of tobacco growing in Ireland, and whether the same have been extended by the present Government, and, if so, for what period.

There are many people who think that tobacco growing might be made a profitable industry in Ireland, and the late Government granted certain fiscal remissions and facilities to enable this to be proved. Those who were trying the experiment, however, said that the facilities were not sufficient to enable them to decide whether or not it would be successful as a commercial speculation. I hope when the noble Lord replies he will be able to tell me that His Majesty's Government are prepared to extend these facilities, not only for the period of time that I believe they are willing to extend them, but also in the sense of giving greater facilities for the making of the experiment.

I do not know whether your Lordships are aware of the past legislation with regard to the growth of tobacco in Ireland. In the reign of Charles II., I believe it was beginning to prove a profitable industry in this country; so much so that it alarmed the Colonists in North America, in Maryland and Virginia, who up to that time had had a monopoly of the industry, and they persuaded the Government of the day to pass a series of Acts by which a fine of no less than £1,600 per acre was levied on any tobacco grown in Ireland. Not only that, but the crop was wholly destroyed. Under these circumstances your Lordships will not be astonished to learn that the industry did not flourish. After the secession of the North American colonies this Act was repealed, but it was re-enacted in 1831, when the experiment had again been tried, owing to the jealousy of British manufacturers.

There is a Bill now in another place which may reach your Lordships before long, with the object of doing away with this penalty; but, in the meantime, I hope the noble Lord will be able to assure me that His Majesty's Government intend doing all they can to extend these facilities, and to aid as much as it is in their power to do the development of what may prove to be one of the great resources of Ireland.

LORD DENMAN; My Lords, I hope I shall be able to give the noble Lord some at all events of the information he desires in a very few sentences. The late Government in December, 1903, decided to aid the experimental growth of tobacco in Ireland by granting for a period of five years a rebate of one-third of the current rates of duty for imported tobacco on crops on certain areas specially selected by the Irish Board of Agriculture. At the beginning of this year representations were made to His Majesty's Government that the period—five years—allowed by the late Government was not sufficiently long to enable the experiment to be thoroughly carried out. Therefore His Majesty's Government decided to extend the period for which they were prepared to grant a rebate of duty for another five years—that is to say, the rebate will continue, so far as this Government can say, until the year 1913.

The noble Lord went on to ask if we could relax some of the restrictions under which the industry is carried on. I must remind him that at present it is an entirely experimental industry. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a letter to Mr. William Redmond, informed him that the object of the extension, as of the original grant of the rebate, was merely to demonstrate the possibility of tobacco growing in Ireland as a commercial proposition, but not the establishment of a protected industry, and it will, of course, be necessary to continue the rules whereby tobacco cultivation is confined within a certain limited approved area. With regard to one or two restrictions, negotiations are now being carried on between the two Departments principally concerned, the Treasury and the Irish Office, and possibly I shall be able to give the noble Lord a fuller answer later in the session.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, I have listened with interest coupled with astonishment to the reply just given by the noble Lord, for not long ago, I ventured to ask, in view of the establishment of an industry—the sugar beet industry—which promised to be a more extensive one in this country than the tobacco growing industry in Ireland, whether either a grant or a rebate of the Excise duty could be allowed for the purpose of enabling that industry to be properly established. My remarks were then denounced in eloquent terms by the noble Lord and by the noble Earl the Minister for Agriculture, who said that my proposal was nothing more nor less than protection, and because it was protection was therefore anathema, although both of them admitted that the sugar beet industry might be a very profitable one.

I have now heard with the greatest astonishment that what it was wrong to do in England it is perfectly right to do in Ireland. Because the Irish demand is made by an extremely eloquent party in another place, and the English demand is made by one humble member of your Lordships' House, it is hard upon the agriculturists of this country that my proposal has been so differently treated, and I now ask whether it will be reconsidered by His Majesty's Government. Two considerations will operate much against the introduction of capital for this industry—one the impossibility without some such help as I ask for from the Government of showing what might be called a manufacturing profit, and the other the attitude of the Government generally on the Brussels Convention, to which I will allude on another occasion. But for the present, in view of the interest taken in this question by British agriculturists, I now ask whether the Government will be willing to do for British agriculture what they are apparently now willing to do for Irish tobacco growers.

*THE LORD-PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The EARL of CREWE): My Lords, I need hardly say that we were not aware that the noble Earl opposite would reproduce any part of the exceedingly able and interesting speech he made on the question of the beet sugar industry some time ago. If I had supposed that that was likely, I would have taken the opportunity of refreshing my memory with regard to that particular subject. I must, however, point out to him that it appears to me at first sight that there is scarcely any, if any, analogy between these two different matters.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: Oh! Why?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I will endeavour to make that clear to the noble Earl. These Irish experiments in tobacco-growing are purely and avowedly experiments. There is no question whatever, as the matter now stands, of assisting people to grow tobacco for profit in Ireland. What it is desired to find out is whether the tobacco plant can under existing conditions be grown there at a profit. My recollection of my noble friend's speech on the beet industry is that he regarded it as already sufficiently proved that sugar beet could be grown at a profit in this country, and that what he asked the Government to do was to subsidise on a very considerable scale the large sugar industry which in these circumstances he thought might be started.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I would point out that growing sugar beet is one thing, and manufacturing sugar from it another. I want to have the possibility of manufacturing proved.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: That may be so. But I should certainly have supposed that, as regards the mere process of manufacture, under cover, there is nothing to be proved in this country which had not already been proved in France and Germany. What the noble Earl suggested was that by subsidising the manufacture, people would be induced to come forward with large amounts of capital, and that the sugar industry so aided by public funds could compete in the markets of the world. There is no analogy whatever between that and what is being done now in Ireland with regard to tobacco. If Ireland demanded to be allowed to have a free production of tobacco and at the same time to enjoy this rebate of duty, then I admit there would be a reasonable analogy between the two cases. If and when such a demand is made no doubt my noble friend will be prepared with an answer; but in the meantime I cannot admit there is any analogy between the two cases.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, I sincerely hope that the noble Earl who has raised this question of the beet sugar industry will renew his demand at no distant date. His Majesty's Government occupy a most extraordinary position in this matter. We are told that the Government were elected on many mandates, but if they had one mandate which, according to them, was more imperative than another, it was the maintenance of free trade according to its strictest interpretation. Though I confess I was glad to hear from the representative of the Treasury that it was proposed to continue the encouragement of the growth of tobacco in Ireland, I was astonished to hear that this was the decision of a free-trade Government. My astonishment is only mitigated by the knowledge that this is not the first time this session that a free-trade Government have been compelled to resort to protectionist measures. Only yesterday we found noble Lords who hold free trade views explaining to us that when they asked for State support for a particular industry at a particular time they did so for very important reasons; and one noble Lord went so far as to explain that he advocated it because he held the principle, *De minimis non curat lex.*

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: I do not know whether the noble Viscount is referring to me, but, if he is, I should like to state that I said exactly the opposite. I said that, as a strong free-trader, I thought *De minimis non curat lex* was a humiliating answer to have to return, and it was an answer which I was not prepared to give. I said that when we applied for the grant to such economists as Lord Goschen and Lord Welby, we assumed that we had made out such a cogent case that they were willing to say that the public necessity over-rode the canons of political economy. I do not suppose for a moment that Lord Goschen or Lord Welby would have admitted *De minimis non curat lex* as a good argument, any more than I would myself.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: If public necessity is to over-ride political economy, we only ask that these things shall be treated upon their merits, and that, when public necessity demands it, the canons of political economy shall not be allowed to stand in the way of what is considered good for the country. That is what noble Lords opposite are finding. They come down one day and encourage tobacco-growing in Ireland. Another day they encourage horse-breeding, and then they bring in a Merchant Shipping Bill which is totally contrary to all the canons of political economy as they understand it. I certainly think my noble friend may fairly look for some consideration for the industry of which he has made himself the mouthpiece. I do not see why only one or two industries should be favoured, and why those industries should be selected which are represented by those who have a great voice in the Ministerial Party in the other House. I understand that what my noble friend wants to ascertain is whether the manufacture of sugar can be made a commercial success in this country, just as the noble Lord opposite has said the Treasury wish to ascertain whether tobacco-growing can be made a commercial success in Ireland.

LORD DENMAN: His Majesty's Government have consented to the continuance of a rebate. Do I understand from the noble Viscount that if he had his way, this rebate would not be continued to the tobacco-growing industry in Ireland?

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: The noble Lord misunderstands me. I am glad that the Government have seen their way to continue this rebate. But we want the Government to give the same assistance to ascertaining whether the manufacture of sugar can be made a commercial success in this country.

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, I do not think the noble Earl, who raised the question with regard to the beet sugar industry this evening, can have followed very closely the course of Irish legislation in the past. The noble Earl seemed to look upon it as a grievance that what was considered right in Ireland appeared to be regarded as wrong in England. My recollection of Irish legislation is that the Party now in power have always gone on those lines, and, as an Irishman, I am not in the least astonished that they have done so. In view of the statement made by Lord Denman I would like to ask whether, if tobacco-growing in Ireland is proved to be a commercial success, the Government intend to withdraw the facilities now offered. On this matter Nationalists and Unionists are united, and if the Government intend to withdraw the rebate, should the experiment prove a success, I can assure them that all parties in Ireland are going to make a row, and the noble Lord will have a very hot time.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I should like to know whether I am to understand that if the question of experimenting alone were raised, the Government would be inclined to consider the demand in a more favourable light. All I want is to be able to prove it as an experiment. I pointed out that, owing to the nature of the industry, it was impossible to get any further in experiments without more capital. If we had an assurance from His Majesty's Government that they would give facilities for an isolated experiment, I would put forward a definite proposal with that view.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: What I said was that if the time came when Ireland demanded that tobacco-growing should be removed from the domain of experiment and that free cultivation of it with the rebate should be allowed, the whole matter would have to be reconsidered. The question would then have reached the same stage as the case the noble Earl puts forward. I certainly understood the noble Earl to ask, in his first speech, that the manufacture of sugar on a large scale should be subsidised by public money.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I do not understand the object of the rebate which the Government are now giving. If this experiment fails we all know what will happen; but, on the other hand, let us suppose for the sake of argument that it succeeds, and that it is proved that tobacco can be grown in Ireland at a profit by means of this rebate. If the Government mean that when the experiment succeeds in Ireland with the rebate, the matter is to be reconsidered, I quite agree with Lord Meath that there must be a row. I cannot imagine anything which would irritate an Irishman, or, indeed, an Englishman or a Scotsman, more than to start him on an experiment with a little encouragement, and, as soon as he has proved that there is something in it and that he can make it a success, to say he must go back to the strict rules of political economy and that if he cannot carry on the industry without the aid of the rebate then he shall not carry it on at all. Being a Scotsman I have very great hesitation in giving advice to Irishmen, but if I were an Irishman I should always maintain that the matter was still in the experimental stage, and promise that when it ceased to be so, and became a commercial matter the Government would be duly informed.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE: I beg to thank the noble Lord for his answer. The British Government previously put a stop to this industry in Ireland, and it seems to me that they propose to repeat that action if it is shown once more that tobacco can be grown in that country.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, at the risk of being disorderly, I rise to say a word or two in answer to the different observations which have been made. The noble Earl opposite, Lord Camperdown, looked as far ahead as 1913 when the present Government, notwithstanding its great majority, will not be in office. In reply to the remarks of Lord Ridley on the general question of protection, I would venture to point out that the rebate was given by the late Government, not by the present Government.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: But it was continued by the present Government.

LORD DENMAN: Yes; but does the noble Viscount mean that we should stop all assistance to this industry, after the action taken by the late Government?

Noble Lords on both sides of the House advocate continuity of policy. Surely this is a case in point.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: As the present Government have continued the rebate it is to be presumed that they approve of it.

House adjourned at Five o'clock to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 17*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Portsmouth Water Bill [Lords]; Ritz Hotel Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

Crediton Gas Bill [Lords]; Truro Gas Bill [Lords]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, London United Tramways Bill; Watford Gas Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881." [Conveyancing Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890." [Settled Land Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill. intituled, "An Act to amend The Married Women's Property Act, 1882." [Married Women's Property Bill [Lords].

And, also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the municipal and police boundaries of the burgh of Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven; to authorise the provosts, magistrates, and councillors of the burgh to construct a new street; and for other purposes." [Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords].

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords.] Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Aikton Dorset; Eryholme; Evenwood; Findon; Horsham; Kirkbampton; Kirkbride; Ludlow; Orton; Penalt; Rosley with

Woodside; Thursby (two); Waverton cum Dundraw; and, Wiston; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; From Buckden; Chipping Ongar; Geldesten; Great Yarmouth; Headlington Quarry; and, Steynton; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.

Petition from Bicester, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Titwood, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions for alteration; From North Salford; Southport; and, Wokingham; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (WARLIKE OPERATIONS) (KILLED AND WOUNDED).

Return [presented July 16th] to be printed. [No. 262.]

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.

Paper [presented July 16th] to be printed. [No. 263.]

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 20) Warrant, 1906, dated June 30th, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MOTOR CARS (PROSECUTIONS).

Copy presented, of Return of all proceedings for offences in connection with the driving of Motor Cars during the period from July 1st, 1904 to June 30th, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND JUDGE'S COURT (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 11th; *Mr. Clancy*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264.]

HUMBER CONSERVANCY COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Humber Conservancy Commission [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 16th; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3671 to 3673 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered June 18th; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 266.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Visits of Inspector to Evicted Farms—County Clare.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have given their inspector instructions to visit evicted farms in the county of Clare that have been grabbed; and, if not, will he say why this has not been done, and with a view of settling with the grabbers and reinstating the evicted tenants; and whether he will inquire why the inspector did not visit such farms when on inspection recently in Clare.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that all applications for reinstatement received from evicted tenants in Clare have been referred to the local inspector for inquiry and report. The inspector can only visit and inspect evicted farms with the consent of the owner and present occupier, and if he has not done so in some cases the presumption is that he has not received the necessary permission. If the hon. Member will give particulars of the cases to which he refers, the Commissioners will, they inform me, have further inquiries made.

Licensed Premises on Estates of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in London.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the hon. Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, whether he will state the acreage, population, and localities of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' estates in London, and the number of public-houses on each of them.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Ecclesiastical Commissioners are not prepared to give this information.

Licensed Houses owned by Ecclesiastical Commissioner in Lancashire and Cheshire.

MR. CROSSLEY (Cheshire, Altrincham): To ask the hon. Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, the number of licensed houses owned by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the counties of Lancashire and Cheshire respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The number of public-houses on the estates of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the county of Lancashire, so far as is known, is fifty-seven, and in the county of Cheshire two.

World's Postage Rates.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the Chamber of Commerce of Berlin is now agitating for a reduction of the world's postage rates; and whether he will enter into communication with the German Government upon this question with the view to co operation upon the basis of a universal penny postage rate.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have no information on the subject. The proposal for universal penny postage was strongly opposed by the German Delegates at the Rome Congress, as also was the proposal for the reduction of the general rate to 2d. I do not anticipate, therefore, that the German Government would be prepared to take any steps in this direction.

Duties of Male Sorting Clerks and Telegraphists at Richmond, Surrey.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether any decision has been arrived at in the case of the recent appeal by the male sorting clerks and telegraphists at Richmond, Surrey, against the revision of duties at that office; and, if not, will he take steps to hasten the same with a view to relieving the staff of the number of split duties and the extended hours of attendance.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A new list of duties was brought into force in May last at Richmond Post Office in anticipation of a revision of the force, which has been in hand for some time. The appeal of the sorting clerks and telegraphists for a further revision of the duties is being considered, and it is hoped to bring into operation at an early date a scheme of improved duties, which have now become practicable owing to the change of the circumstances.

Allocation of Subsidy for Carriage of Mails by Peninsular and Oriental Company.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): To ask the Postmaster-General how the subsidy payable to the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for the conveyance of mails is apportionted between the various Colonies and countries concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The subsidy of £340,000 to the Peninsular and Oriental Company for the conveyance of mails to and from India, the eastern Colonies, and Australia, is paid by the United Kingdom, and towards this amount contributions from India and the Colonies are received as follows:—

	£
India - - -	61,226
Ceylon - - -	5,367
Straits Settlements -	7,196
Hong Kong - -	12,529
	£86,318

Factory Acts—Overtime Regulations.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the remark made by one of the lady inspectors, Miss Deane, quoted in the Annual Report of Factories and Workshops for 1905, that she had found the greatest difficulty in obtaining any correct idea of the amount of overtime actually worked in a jam factory by the various individuals, and that indeed it was impossible to do so; that the number of special exceptions, taken together with the permission to work separate overtime in all sorts of different departments which are busy at different seasons of the year, makes evasion of the Act easy, and even renders the comprehension of the regulations extremely difficult, a circumstance which is not seldom pleaded as a valid excuse for infringing the law; and whether he proposes to take measures to remedy such abuse of the permission of overtime for young persons in an occupation very exhausting to their strength.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have seen the remarks of the inspector to which the right hon. Member calls attention. So far as young persons are concerned, the only overtime permissible in the jam industry is that allowed by Section 41 of the Act in respect of certain emergency processes during the four summer months, and in their case, therefore, the difficulty under the special exception as to separate departments do not arise. Further, by the Order which the Secretary of State has power to make under Section 41 for regulating the work on these emergency processes, special conditions as to intervals, hours of work, and the lifting of heavy weights have been imposed for the protection of young persons. I am arranging for special attention to be given to jam works during the present busy season; and when the reports of the inspectors are received I will consider what steps can be taken to simplify the present provisions affecting the industry and generally to secure more complete protection for the workers.

Education Grants.

MR. WINFREY (Norfolk, S. W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education what are the just ande quitable terms per headof average attendances where one local education authority as a matter of the efficiency or convenience educates a number of elementary school children belonging to another local education authority; and whether the Board of Education are prepared to fix a reasonable and honest price per head in all such cases and to enforce payment.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The decision of the point named in the Question depends inevitably upon a variety of circumstances incidental to the particular case, and it would be, therefore, quite impossible to lay down any general rule in regard to it that would properly be applicable in all cases.

Religious Instruction in Schools.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the school managers may make a separate arrangement, and pay the existing teachers for giving religious instruction for the forty-five minutes from 9 a.m. to 9.45 a.m.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Question would appear to refer to the condition of things which may arise in future under the Education Bill; but it is impossible to give a reply on so general a question, which must always depend entirely on the circumstances of the individual cases.

MR. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state the number of schools in England and in Wales in which there is no religious instruction.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have no information beyond that contained in the Parliamentary Returns now being presented to Parliament.

Control of Motor Omnibus Traffic.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what powers of regulation and control over motor omnibuses and motor omnibus traffic are possessed by him.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Local Government Board are empowered by Section 6 of the Locomotives on Highways Act, 1896, to make regulations with respect to motor cars on highways, and their construction and the conditions under which they may be used. Regulations under the section may be either general or local in character. By Section 7 of the Motor Car Act, 1903, they may make regulations dealing generally with the registration and identification of motor cars and the licensing of drivers.

Section 12 of the same Act gives them power to prescribe the use and construction of heavy motor cars, including a power to make regulations as to speed. General regulations have been issued under these three sections applicable to motor omnibuses. Power is given by Section 8 of the Act of 1903 to prohibit or restrict the driving of motor cars on special highways, and by Section 9 to restrict the rate of speed within any specified limits or place.

Stock Exchange Gambling and Government Securities.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Government is aware that, owing to the forced liquidation on the London Stock Exchange of trust securities such as Consols and Government stocks, and also of South African mining, railway, and other shares, mainly to meet gambling differences, the depreciation in the aggregate value of all those securities in comparison with their quotations previous to the Boer war has been estimated at about £800,000,000, and whether the Government will take some measure to protect *bona fide* owners and investors from a continuance of those forced liquidations, principally brought on by the agency of international bull and bear gambling in fictitious securities.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I am aware that the depreciation in the capital value of Stock Exchange securities in the period to which my hon. friend refers has been very considerable. Many different causes have contributed to bring this about; but I should not like to commit myself to the opinion that it has been due in the main to international gambling. In any case, I know of no means by which the Government could control such transactions.

Opium Exports from India.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R. Holmfirth): To ask the Secretary of State for India what has been the quantity of opium sold in India for export during the last four or five years; and whether a declaration was made last month in Calcutta, as is usual, as to the quantity to be sold during the next ensuing opium year, and the quantity so declared.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) In the four years ending 1905 the annual number of chests of opium sold in India for export was 48,000. For 1906 the number is 52,800. In June of this year an announcement was made that 52,800 chests would be sold in 1907.

Alleged Improper Seizure of Dead Pigs by Sanitary Authorities at Cookstown.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether inspectors appointed by the city council of Belfast have been recently attending trains and examining dead pigs brought in from the country markets by Belfast firms; whether on the 7th instant four pigs which had cost top market price and had been passed by the market inspector were were seized out of Cookstown and condemned; whether the owner requested the inspector to give him a piece of the carcase which he considered diseased in order that he might be submitted to the Professor of Pathology in Queen's College, and was refused; whether, on the inspector making an application before Mr. Hodder, R.M., for an order to have the carcases destroyed, the owner was refused a hearing; whether the Professor of Pathology in Queen's College has since certified that the part of the carcase submitted to him was free from tuberculosis; and if he can say why Mr. Hodder, R.M., refused to hear the owner, and if Graham, the inspector who seized the pigs, has been appointed a sanitary officer by the Belfast Corporation; and, if so, has the appointment been confirmed and his duties prescribed by the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that on the 7th instant Inspector Graham, a sanitary officer of the Belfast Corporation, seized four dead pigs as being affected with tuberculosis and unfit for human food. The inspector declined to give up any portion of the carcases until application for their destruction had been made to the magistrates. Mr. Hodder, R.M., the chairman of the Bench, adjourned the hearing for a few hours in order that the owners of the carcases might be professionally represented, and on the further hearing solicitors for the owners were fully heard. The magistrates ordered the destruction of the carcases, which were proved by two veterinary surgeons to be affected with tuberculosis. According to evidence produced by the owners, the highest market price had been paid for the animals. The owners were subsequently allowed to take portions of the carcases for examination by the Professor of Pathology in Queen's College, and it is understood that the professor found that tubercular disease existed. Mr. Graham has been appointed a sanitary officer by the Corporation of Belfast, and his appointment has been confirmed by the Local Government Board. The duties of such officers are not prescribed by the Board.

Lismore Salmon Weir.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at Lismore salmon weir on the River Blackwater, in the county Waterford, there is besides a killing hatch two dummy hatches or gratings which are kept closed instead of open during the weekly close time; and whether, in the interest of the salmon fisheries of the river, the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Agriculture will hold an inquiry as to the legality of these dummy hatches not being opened during the weekly close time, in view of the effect this fact is believed to have on the number of salmon which get into upper reaches.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The question of the illegality at Lismore Weir is not one which can be decided by the Department of Agriculture, but is a matter for the legal tribunals of the country, before which it can be brought by the local board of conservators or by any interested person who may be so advised.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Cost of Battleships.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can give an approximate estimate of the relative cost of eight battleships in full commission, such as the Atlantic Fleet, and eight battleships with nucleus crews on board ready for mobilisation, under the system established by Lord Selborne's Memorandum, December 6th, 1904.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The Board of Admiralty are of opinion that it is not in the interests of the public service to give the information for which the hon. Member asks.

British First-Class Battleships.

MR. BELLAIRS: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Surrey Division of Guildford, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Return, No. 129, Fleets (Great Britain and Foreign Countries), includes, as first-class battleships, seven French, and no German battleships launched prior to the National Defence Act of 1889; and whether the French battleships have been reconstructed and are being maintained, whereas, with the exception of slight alterations, the British battleships have not been reconstructed, and are not being maintained in a state fit to commission on the outbreak of war.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The figures given in the first part of the hon. Member's Question are correct, and I am informed that of the seven French battleships in question, six have been reconstructed, and the seventh is now in hand. As regards the eight British battleships referred to, the "Nile" and "Trafalgar" have been rearmed as far as their secondary armaments are concerned, and are now ready for immediate service if required. The remaining six are in special reserve and could be brought forward for active service in about six weeks.

Army Pensions.

MR. H. R. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that various boards of guardians have recently passed Resolutions to the effect that, in their opinion, the present system of paying Army pensions quarterly or monthly is a direct cause of thriftlessness and an indirect cause of pauperism among ex-soldiers; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of arranging for such pensions to be paid weekly.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): My attention has been drawn to various Resolutions on this subject. The whole question is at present under consideration.

Norfolk Artillery Militia.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how soon the abolition of the Norfolk Artillery Militia will take place; and whether it is intended to convert the whole or a portion of this corps into ammunition train for the Regular Army.

MR. HALDANE: There is no intention of abolishing the Norfolk Artillery Militia. It is intended that the Garrison Artillery Militia shall in future form a Field Artillery reserve.

Army and Militia Recruits.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what was the total number of recruits for the Army and Militia respectively enlisted in 1904; and how many of the recruits in each case were nineteen years of age and upwards on enlistment.

MR. HALDANE: The total number of recruits for the Regular Forces in the year ending September 30th, 1904, was 42,642, of whom 21,154 were nineteen years of age or over. The number of recruits for the Militia for this period was 35,264, of whom 13,618 were nineteen years of age or over. The noble Lord will find all this information in the General Annual Report.

Native Execution in India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to give any explanation of the circumstances under which Udoya Patni, of Sylhet, in Eastern Bengal and Assam, was hanged under the orders of the Lieutenant-Governor, although his prayer for mercy had been transmitted by the Lieutenant-General to the Governor-General in Council, and the orders of the Governor-General, granting a reprieve, arrived after the execution had taken place; and whether he can state what action he has taken, or proposes to take in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I have nothing to add to the very full statement which I made on Thursday last.† I am in communication with the Government of India; it is their affair rather than mine.

Poppy Cultivation in British India.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that, notwithstanding Resolutions adopted by this House and assurances given by successive Governments that the area of poppy cultivation in British India should be materially reduced, the area under poppy in British India has been increased from 458,481 acres in 1893–4 to 642,831 acres in 1903–4; and whether, in view of these facts and of the Resolution unanimously adopted by this House on May 30th last, he will instruct the Indian Government to effect a substantial reduction in the area under poppy during the coming season.

MR. MORLEY: The matter has already attracted my attention. I understand that owing to good seasons and the anxiety of the cultivators to take licenses for poppy cultivation and to utilise them to the full, the area under the crop has of late years increased without any active effort on the part of the Opium Department. Since 1903–4, however, there has been a material reduction, the area in 1904–5 being only 587,091 acres. I am in communication with the Viceroy as to the area for which licenses should be granted in the coming season, but at present I am unable to make a statement on the subject.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) was understood to ask if a reduction could not be secured by lowering the price paid for opium.

MR. MORLEY: That is a technical Question, of which I should like to have notice.

Indo-Chinese Opium Trade.

MR. BAKER (Finsbury, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in any communications which may pass between His Majesty's Government and the Chinese Government on the Indo-Chinese opium trade, after the adoption of the Resolution of the House of Commons on May 30th last,† His Majesty's Government will endeavour to give effect to the declaration of policy made by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords in June, 1898, that Great Britain should invite China into paths of reform.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 1046.

MR. MORLEY: As I stated in this House on May 30th,† His Majesty's Government propose to ascertain in the first place exactly what the proposals and inclinations of the Chinese Government are, and secondly to see whether they can in some way meet those views. Invitation is unnecessary, if the Chinese Government have already taken up the matter. Otherwise, Lord Salisbury's remark that it is difficult to reform those who do not wish to be reformed, would apply.

SIR H. COTTON: Is it the intention of His Majesty's Government to take the initiative or to leave it to China to do that?

MR. MORLEY: My hon. friend could not have listened to my Answer or he would have known that action has already been taken.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire W.R., Ripon): Arising out of the Answer to that Question, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will inquire of His Majesty's Minister at Pekin, whether there is any likelihood of the Chinese Government being able effectually to prohibit the growing of low-grade and, therefore, more deleterious opium in China itself; and, if not, whether the stoppage of imports of high-grade opium into China might not have a result the reverse of that which we all desire on humanitarian grounds?

MR. MORLEY said that before answering that rather complicated Question he must consult with his advisers and see what could be done.

Indo-Burmese Opium Trade.

MR. BAKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will grant a Return of the amount of Indian opium annually consumed in Burmah during the last thirty years; and whether, seeing that it is generally recognised that the use of the drug is opposed both to the national customs and religion of the Burmese, it is proposed to take any steps to lessen the consumption of it in that country.

MR. MORLEY: I have no objection to granting the Return. The present arrangements for the sale of opium in Burmah are intended to lessen the consumption of it in that country, especially among the Burmese, and are being carefully watched. There are other races in Burmah whose customs and religion are not opposed to the use of opium.

Railways in Northern Nigeria.

MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the Crown Agent's letter to his Department, of 19th April, 1905, in which it was stated that, with the small amount of information then in the possession of the Government, it would be disastrous to fetter the future by taking any precipitate action in regard to the construction of a railway in Northern Nigeria, whether such further surveys have since been carried out as have placed all material information at the disposal of the Government.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The surveys proposed have not all been carried out, but the Secretary of State considers that he has now sufficient information to enable him to arrive at certain conclusions with regard to the construction of railways in Nigeria, and I hope shortly to be in a position to make a statement on the subject.

Population of Northern Nigeria.

MR. WALKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to Sir F. Lugard's statement, in his last annual Report, that the estimated figures of the population of Northern Nigeria bear striking witness to the devastation caused by war and slave raids, whether, before the construction of a railway in that protectorate is recommended, a careful estimate will be made, and laid before the House, as to the likelihood that a sufficient supply of labour will be available locally for the proposed cultivation of cotton.

---

† See (4) *Debates* clviii., 514.

MR. CHURCHILL: Sir F. Lugard's statement does not imply that there would be an insufficient supply of labour for the cultivation of cotton in the districts suitable for cotton growing which would be traversed by the proposed railway to Kano. Large quantities of cotton are already grown in those districts, and it would seem from Mr. Weir's Report on the Railway Survey published in Cd. 2787 (page 178) that there is a large and industrious population, well accustomed to agricultural pursuits. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that the construction of a railway is recommended for reasons of military economy and administrative convenience as well as in connection with the cultivation of cotton, and the general development of trade.

Flogging in the Chinese Compounds.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a Government inquiry was held in the compound of the Cason Mine on June 15th last into the truth or otherwise of the affidavit sworn by Mr. Thomas Ratcliffe regarding the flogging of a Chinese coolie; that the inquiry was attended by the general manager of the mine and other persons connected with the Farrar group, together with the Government officials and five Commissioners of Police; that in the course of the inquiry coolie No. 277 stated, through an interpreter, that the compound manager and the Chinese controls intimidated him so that he swore untruthfully that he had not been flogged, but that the other affidavit which he had taken stating that he had been flogged was the true one; will he say whether Mr. Ratcliffe was discharged within a few hours of his having sworn the affidavit which was the subject of the inquiry; and whether he will state what steps the Government propose to take to protect the coolies and the white miners from undue influence exercised by the mine managers.

MR. CHURCHILL: The following account has been received from Lord Selborne by telegraph: Inquiry was held June 15th by Mr. Showers, Commissioner of Police at Cason mine; Inspector Stewart acted as interpreter. Mr. Wilkinson, Inspector of Foreign Labour, was present; Mr. Cuthwaite and the manager and other representatives of the mine. In the course of very voluminous evidence Coolie 277 stated that he had been flogged and referring to his original statement which was to the effect that he had not been flogged, said: "I made a statement before the inspector of Foreign Labour. I was afraid to give a correct statement as I did not know that trouble might arise." It was on this inquiry that proceedings were instituted against Jimson which terminated, as stated in my telegram of July 7th, in a preparatory examination before the Magistrate being taken against Ratcliffe. In the case against Jimson, Coolie 277 returned to his original statement that he had not been flogged, and according to newspaper report of the first day of preparatory examination against Ratcliffe which is now adjourned till July 27th, he adheres very firmly to this statement, saying that everything he had said before the Commissioner of Police was false. Full report of inquiry by the Commissioner of Police left by to-day's mail. The Secretary of State has not been informed as to when Mr. Ratcliffe was discharged, and proposes to await the receipt of the report.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Is it true that the magistrate said something to the effect that Mr. Ratcliffe was guilty of perjury?

MR. CHURCHILL: The evidence was that the testimony of the Chinese coolie, which was material, was not to be relied upon, as on three occasions he made diametrically opposite statements. I do not know whether the statement attributed to the magistrate was made by him, but it is the fact that when the coolie repudiated his original evidence the case against Jimson fell through and proceedings were commenced and are still proceeding against Ratcliffe.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): Has coolie 277 no name?

Mr. CHURCHILL said he had, but he did not know the name, nor did he think it would facilitate proceedings if he did.

Kaffir Labour Recruiting Licences.

*Mr. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have given directions to Lord Selborne that licences to recruit Kaffir labourers for the mines are to be issued to all respectable and responsible persons; and, if so, what is causing the delay in the issue of such licences.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I understand that licences are issued to all labour agents in the Transvaal, who are respectable and responsible persons, and who recruit for definite employers. With regard to licences for recruiting in Portuguese East Africa I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer of yesterday to the Member for Bethnal Green South-West.†

Slave Trade in Morocco.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the police which are to be appointed in the coast towns of Morocco on the recommendation of the Algeciras Conference will have power to stop the public sale of slaves in those towns.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): His Majesty's Government entertain no doubt that the police who are to be appointed in the coast towns of Morocco, being under the sovereign authority of the Sultan, will have power to carry out whatever instructions he may issue in regard to the prohibition of the public sale of slaves in those towns, and the attention of His Majesty's Minister will be called to this Question.

Mr. ASHLEY: Are we to understand that the police are not under the control of the Foreign Ministers, but under the control of the Sultan?

Sir EDWARD GREY: If I remember rightly, the condition was that there were to be instructors appointed by the European Governments, but the force was to be under the control of the Sultan.

Commercial Agencies at Belgrade and Sofia.

Mr. BAKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any steps are being taken to carry out the recommendations of His Majesty's consuls at Belgrade and Sofia for the establishment of a commercial agency and bank in those cities.

Sir EDWARD GREY: It has not been thought desirable to carry out these particular proposals respecting a commercial bank and agency.

Inspectorate of the Welsh Coal Field.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the special dangers of the South Wales coalfield requiring a strong inspectorate extend to that part of the coalfield situate in Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire in Mr. Martin's district; whether Mr. Atkinson will act as superintending inspector over the whole of the South Wales coalfield, or only over that portion of it comprised in the Swansea and Cardiff districts; and, if only over the latter, can he say why any distinction has been drawn between those districts and the Newport district in this respect.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): No part of Glamorganshire is included within the southern district which is under Mr. Martin's charge. As regards the Monmouthshire mines, I understand that they correspond in character to the mines in the rest of the South Wales coalfield and the arrangements for their inspection will have to be considered when a vacancy in the southern district occurs.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what additional cost to the Treasury is involved in the appointment of Mr. Atkinson as superintending inspector for South Wales instead of inspector for the Swansea district only, as originally intended.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 1330.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The appointment of Mr. Atkinson to be superintending inspector will not in itself involve any additional cost to the Treasury. The additional expenditure involved by the new arrangements will be an allowance of £150 a year to the assistant inspector appointed to act as an inspector in charge of the Swansea District, and the salary of an additional assistant inspector to take the place of that officer, *i.e.*, a salary of £300 a year, rising to £400.

Merchant Shipping Laws in the Channel Islands.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Degartment if he will state what action has been taken with a view to secure the extension of the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Laws of the United Kingdom to the Channel Islands.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am in communication with the Insular Authorities and with the Board of Trade, and I am not yet in a position to make any statement.

Vaccination Prosecution at Chester-le-Street.

MR. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, in the prosecution of Mr. Dixon at Chester-le-Street police court, on the 4th instant, the public vaccinator stated that he was the private medical attendant of the defendant, that the child in question was not well enough in health to be vaccinated within the period provided by statute, that had he called at the home he could only have postponed the vaccination for two months, but that his scale of payment was not sufficient to recompense him for calling at the home unless he could perform the vaccination; whether it is the duty of the public vaccinator, in cases where, in his opinion, children are too delicate or too ill to render vaccination advisable, to furnish the parents with certificates of postponement; and whether he will take steps to see that such protection is afforded to parents in the Chester-le-Street Union.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): It is the duty of a public vaccinator to postpone the vaccination of a child if, at the time of his visit, the child is not in his opinion in a fit and proper state to be successfully vaccinated. I understand from the public vaccinator referred to in the Question that he always adopts this course, and that he did not make the statement attributed to him as to the insufficiency of his scale of payment to recompense him for calling at the home unless he could perform the vaccination. He further states that in the particular instance mentioned his partner was Mr. Dixon's medical attendant, and that the child had been delicate until the age of about four and a half months, but was fit for vaccination at the time the father told him that he would have the child vaccinated by his own medical man.

Preston Post Office Staff.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General why the revision due to the Preston office in 1904 has not been brought into operation; and whether, if it is intended to withhold it till after the result of the present inquiry into the pay of postal servants is known, the revision will be based upon the needs of the office at that time or when the original revision became due.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Proposals to revise the indoor force at Preston were put forward in March 1905, but, the consideration of them was necessarily delayed by the prolonged inquiry which it was found necessary to make in connection with several important points. The inquiries are now practically completed and arrangements will be made as soon as possible for carrying out the revision, which will provide for the requirements of the office at the present time.

School Statistics.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the total number of certified efficient schools in England and Wales, together with the number of scholars in attendance; and in how many cases a guarantee has been required from the owners that they will maintain the school for five years.

The PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The total number of certified efficient schools, not being public elementary schools, in England and Wales is 78. The average attendance is 6,171. It has not been the practice of the Board to require a guarantee from the owners as to the maintenance of the school for a specified period.

Regent Street Quadrant.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a petition, signed by the tenants of shops in Regent Street, has been presented to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests protesting against the design recently approved for the rebuilding of the Quadrant; and whether, having regard to the fact that all the petitioners are either lessees or occupiers of premises in Regent Street, and in view of the majority by which it is signed, he will undertake that their representations shall be carefully considered.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, S.): Such a petition as mentioned has been recently received and is now under consideration.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Licensed Houses in Lincoln.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): On behalf of the hon. Member for Lincoln I beg to ask the hon. Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, what is the number of licensed houses owned by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the county of Lincoln.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): So far as is known, there are two public-houses on the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Estates in the county of Lincoln.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Sunday Sale of Drink.

MR. LEIF JONES: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire, I beg to ask the hon. Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, whether the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in leasing any place to be used as a public-house, or when assenting to the application by a tenant for a licence to keep a public-house, make it a condition that there shall be no sale of drink on Sundays; and, if not, whether they will do so in future.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: The Ecclesiastical Commissioners do not make this a general condition. Fresh lettings for public-houses are rare and are not sanctioned by the Commissioners, except to meet the needs of the locality, when it is open to the licensing authorities to determine whether a six day or a seven day licence is required.

In Answer to a Supplementary Question Mr. Hobhouse was understood to say that the Commissioners largely trusted to the discretion of the magistrates to take into consideration any recommendations they made.

Appointment of Charity Trustees.

MR. SILCOCK (Somersetshire, Wells): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether, in making new schemes for the administration of charities, the Commissioners have ever arranged for the appointment of the whole or a majority of the trustees to be made by election; or whether it is the general practice of the Commissioners to arrange that the whole or a majority of such trustees shall be co-opted; and whether the Commissioners, with a view to securing the satisfactory and impartial administration of charitable trusts, will take steps, by some system of election, to secure the influence of public opinion being brought to bear upon the trustees.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): In framing schemes for the administration of charities the Commissioners do as a rule arrange for the appointment of the whole or a majority of the trustees to be made by election. The Commissioners do take such steps as are indicated by the hon. Member, by the introduction, as a general rule, of trustees appointed by local authorities, and are sensible of the benefits thereby secured in the way of publicity and of responsibility, but they are bound to exercise careful discretion, for the reasons connected with the limits of jurisdiction in cases of large charities which I explained to the hon. Member in my Answer to him last week.†

Scottish Pupil Teachers.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland under reference to the Regulations for the Training of Teachers recently laid upon the Table of the House whether it is the meaning and intention of the Government that pupil teachers should, after December 31st, 1914, cease to be regarded as part of the staff of any school for grant purposes, or whether it is the meaning and intention of the Government to permit, after that date, pupil teachers to continue to be reckoned as part of the teaching staff in the same way as has heretofore been the custom in Scotland; and will pupil teachers, after 1914, be admitted to the training colleges under the same conditions as pupil teachers seeking admission before that date.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Subject to the exceptions stated in Article 71 of the Regulations, after December 31st, 1914, no teachers other than certificated teachers will be recognised as part of a school staff for purposes of grant. As the Regulations now stand, therefore, pupil teachers will cease to be regarded as part of the school staff at that date. But this date may be postponed in subsequent issues of the Regulations should that course be found desirable.

MR. BLACK: Will an amended Minute be laid on the Table?

MR. SINCLAIR: There is no such intention at present. The subject will be considered at the end of the year.

MR. SMEATON asked how it was the *status* of pupil teachers was being altered by Minute and not by Act of Parliament?

MR. SINCLAIR: I must have notice of that Question.

Portarlington Police Force.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he intends reducing the police force at Portarlington; and can he say what reasons exist for maintaining two police barracks and a force of eleven policemen in a town of under 2,000 inhabitants.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the police station at Ballybrittas, Queen's County, is only four miles from Portarlington, where there are two police barracks; and, in view of the fact that the Ballybrittas police station was originally established at the request of a local evicting landlord, whether he will consider its discontinuance.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): I am informed that the police force at Portarlington station consists of seven men. The district attached to the station comprises not only the town, but also a large rural district, including Ballybrittas. There is not a second police station at Portarlington, but there is one at Kilmalogue, which is more than a mile distant and in another county. Four men belong to this station, to which a large rural district in King's County is attached. The Inspector-General considers that the force at both of these stations is necessary. The police station at Ballybrittas was abolished a year and a half ago, so that a reduction in the local police force has recently been made.

Irish Police Pensions.

MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury why, having regard to the fact that Section 7 (2) of the Superannuation Act, 1887, deals only with cases where contributions are made out of money provided by Parliament, the pensions paid on account of soldiers who are inmates of Irish district asylums are reduced by a sum equivalent to the capitation grant claimable; whether this section has been held not to apply to the Dublin Metropolitan Police or the Royal Irish Constabulary; and whether he will give instructions that in future such pensions shall be paid in full without deduction, or that the total amount of the deductions made as a set-off to the capitation grant, roughly about £850 per annum, shall be placed to the credit of the Irish Local Taxation Account, out of which the capitation grants are paid.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 727.

MR. MCKENNA: The Treasury has been advised that a contribution paid out of the Local Taxation Account towards the maintenance of a lunatic is paid out moneys provided by Parliament within the meaning of Section 7 (2) of the Superannuation Act of 1887. It is therefore impossible for me, having regard to the provisions of that section, to give the instructions suggested by the hon. Member. The section does not apply to the Dublin Metropolitan Police or the Royal Irish Constabulary.

The Transvaal Constitution.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): May I ask the Prime Minister in reference to his engagement to do his best to have a statement and debate on the new Constitution to be granted to the Transvaal, whether he can tell us on what day the Estimates on which that discussion will be appropriate are likely to come on, and whether before they come on he would not think it desirable and right to furnish a brief Memorandum indicating the character of the Constitution and the general lines on which the Government propose to frame their Order in Council? The right hon. Gentleman will recognise the importance of the subject and the great difficulty of dealing with it adequately if we know nothing of the policy the Government intend to pursue.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I think some Papers will probably be published which will give a great deal of the information asked for. The date we contemplate for taking the Colonial Office Vote is July 31st. The right hon. Gentleman said that I would do my best, but it is a little more than that. It is better than my best. We have no other idea than that a full statement shall be made of the general principles on that day, but I declined yesterday to pledge myself for the simple reason that we have not yet seen the Report of the Committee. We do not know to what extent it may commend itself to us as furnishing a basis, and therefore I think it is safer not to come under an actual obligation, but, as I say, it is our full intention and expectation that it will come on.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am much obliged. That is the last day of Supply, so that the proceedings would come to a conclusion at ten o'clock, and in that time we shall have to discuss the Transvaal Constitution and the merits and demerits of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies—two large subjects.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the opinion on the second of those is so general and so universal that it will not require much time.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercrombie): Will the Prime Minister bear in mind that a large number of Members have expressed a wish that Chinese labour should be discussed before the present session ends. Is there not a danger of this subject being shut out by a debate on the Transvaal constitution?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot say what topics will occupy the attention of the Committee. The only thing I have stated is that the Government intend to take that opportunity of making a statement of the general principle which will underlie the proposed constitutions for the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

Special Report from the Select Committee, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 267.]

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 268.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 268.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 312.]

NEW BILLS.

TEXTILE WORKERS (SATURDAY AND SUNDAY HOLIDAYS) (No. 2) BILL.

"To prohibit employment between noon on Saturday and six o'clock on Monday morning in woollen, worsted, and silk factories, and in dyeing and bleaching and dyeing works," presented by Mr. Jowett; supported by Mr. Snowden, Mr. Steadman, Mr. Wardle, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Hudson, and Mr. George Roberts; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 313.]

ABSENT VOTERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To facilitate the recording of votes at Parliamentary Elections in Scotland by fishermen, sailors, and other persons liable to habitual and necessary absence from their usual residence in pursuit of their calling," presented by Mr. Alexander Black; supported by Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Crombie, and Mr. John Henderson; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 22nd November, and to be printed. [Bill 314.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the chair.]

Clause 37:—

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) moved an Amendment to make subsection 1 read as follows:—"His Majesty may by Order in Council establish a consultative education committee under the Board of Education, to be called the Welsh Central Committee, consisting of members appointed by the councils of counties and of county boroughs and of boroughs, provided that the President of the Board of Education shall be responsible to Parliament for any act of the Welsh Central Committee done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the committee under this section, and shall have full control over the committee in respect of the exercise of such powers." The proposal contained in the Amendment, he said, was one which he ventured to think it was possible to discuss in a conciliatory spirit and without heat of any kind. There had been a conference in Wales at which representatives of different opinions were present to discuss the whole question of the practicability of a Council for Wales. It certainly seemed a reasonable expectation that the same tone which characterised the proceedings of the conference might also be introduced into the debate in this House. The first observation he had to make was that the scheme came before them in a skeleton shape, which was a serious objection. In the very limited time at their disposal they were not to have the advantage of discussing any details of the scheme. It was difficult to see, if this slipshod method of legislation was appropriate and reasonable in the case of Wales, why the Government might not have evaded the very real difficulties which had been embarrassing them for some time by dealing with education in England in the same manner. It was recognised, however, that such a method would be neither constitutional nor convenient, and one explanation only had been put forward of the extraordinary tactics the Government had thought proper to adopt in the case of Wales. The President of the Board of Trade put the justification entirely upon the ground of the unanimity in Wales on the subject of their educational requirements. If there was any real unanimity amongst all denominations in Wales, not merely as to the principle of the proposal, but also as to the immensely important details involved in it, the only right of any Member who was not a Welsh Member to intervene in the debate would be from the point of view of the English taxpayer. From what the President of the Board of Trade had said, one would gather that under him Wales was more unanimous than it had been since the days of Llewellyn. While acquitting the right hon. Gentleman of any intention to mislead the Committee, the claim for unanimity as he put it forward was as misleading as any such claim could be. There was not, and never had been, any such unanimity in Wales, and the Liberal representative of Canarvonshire said at the conference at Cardiff—

> "It is useless to pass a general resolution in favour of the scheme when you have no details before you."

That was the Liberal and Nonconformist opinion. The right hon. Gentleman said at that conference—

> "So long as we talk about general principles it is very easy to get agreement, but as soon as we try to form a practical plan we find everyone criticising us from every point of view."

It was vaguely alleged that the Anglican and Roman bishops were also unanimously in favour of this proposal The fact was, however, that the Bishop of Llandaff said—

> "We want more information. There are important details which we must consider. It is a serious matter if all the powers in the Board of Education are to be vested in an elective body."

The Bishop of St. Asaph said—

> "I advise we should hasten slowly, and that a committee should consider the whole matter."

The Bishop of St. David's said—

> "This resolution does not go far enough into detail to allow me to commit myself."

Whilst the representatives of voluntary schools who attended that conference were no doubt unanimously in favour of some such proposal as that introduced in the last Parliament or provided by his Amendment, they were not prepared to pledge themselves to the details of this Bill until they were before them, as they ought to be before the Committee of the House of Commons. It was a fact, moreover, that Mr. Lewis Morgan, a Conservative, moved and carried an amendment at the conference providing for an appeal, as in England, to the Board of Education, and not to a national council, and it was on the strength of that resolution such unanimity as was forthcoming was obtained.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): That was the second conference.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said that was so, but the importance of the amendment was not diminished by that circumstance, and he wanted to know whether or not the Government were prepared to adhere to the sense of the Amendment. If so, and if such amendment were found to be workable, then a very strong ground of denominational objection would be removed. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade would take an early opportunity of enlightening them upon the matter. A still more important duty was thrown upon the Committee, that of eliciting some elucidation of the all important details. It was clear the Government had not given the slightest attention to the proposal, indeed he was driven to the conclusion that the Minister in charge had not made the investigation of which the Minister for Education spoke when introducing the Bill, or satisfied himself, not as to the broad principles, but as to the feasibility of working them in practice. The President of the Board of Trade was the only Member of the Cabinet in favour of this proposal. The right hon. Gentleman laughed, but in the course of his speech at the Cardiff Conference he remarked—

> "If the conference does not pass the resolution, there will be joy among eighteen men in the Cabinet."

Was it suggested that the eighteen men in the Cabinet would rejoice at losing a part of the Bill which they considered to be of some value? It was not without significance that the right hon. Gentleman told the conference that all his colleagues in the Cabinet would rejoice if only they could get rid of that part which dealt with Wales.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Bill was not in existence then.

*MR. F. E. SMITH remarked that if the proposal for the Council was not in existence, he would like to know what became of the sanction supposed to be given to it by the conference. There was really only one argument of principle used throughout the conference in favour of the proposal. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "All we ask is that we shall be able to coordinate the branches of education in Wales. We have complete control of secondary education and also of higher education, but primary education is controlled from Whitehall, so far as administration is concerned. It is important to us all that they should fit in."

The real fact, of course, was that Wales had in intermediate education only, the same degree of independence as his Amendment would give her under the Bill. She never had possessed anything like the same wide and dangerous independence in respect of intermediate education as would be given to her by the proposal of the Government to-day.

The only existing difference between Welsh and English secondary schools was that Welsh schools, under the preferential provisions of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act received a Treasury Grant over and above any which was available for the use of English intermediate schools. But the futility of any comparison between Welsh intermediate and elementary education, from the point of view of the Government's proposal, became immediately obvious when it was known that the former affected 10,000 children and the latter 400,000. The most casual observation of the two schemes showed that no argument drawn from the one possessed the slightest value when raised to reinforce the establishment of the other. Nor could any analogy be found in the Welsh Central Board, which really only discharged advisory functions under a delegation from the Board of Education and under conditions which furnished the strongest possible security for the constant exercise of Imperial control. The functions exercised by the Welsh Central Board were comparable to those delegated by the Board of Education to the English Universities in respect of English secondary schools. Summing up this branch of the argument he might claim broadly that since the Act of 1902, which of course applied to Welsh secondary schools, those schools were provided by the authority, aided by grants and subsidised by the Treasury. Over their expenditure and their management the control of the Treasury was constant and direct. The most serious objection to the proposal was the constitutional one. He would like to ask the Minister for Education where was the administrative responsibility to be assigned for the acts of this Welsh Council, and by what detailed steps did he propose to make that administrative responsibility effective? Was a system of checks and balances to develop somehow by a process of physiological evolution? One Welsh Member had said—

> "There will be a Minister responsible for the estimate. It will be necessary to create in some form a Welsh Department. Wales must have a Minister whose position will be analogous to that of the Secretary for Scotland or the Chief Secretary for Ireland."

Was that spokesman authorised to make himself the mouthpiece of the Government in making that declaration? Were these some of the incidental details to be filled in afterwards? They were wilfully destroying by this Bill the only possible means by which the control of the Board of Education could be made effective. They were destroying the inspectorate staff, and how could they anticipate an effective control by the Board of Education when it had no independent information, when the whole interest of the Welsh Council was obviously to save the ratepayers and exploit the taxpayers, and the only representative whom they could claim to have in the House would be some official who might not be able in the slightest to control the acts of a body with strong and definite opinions which arrived at its decisions by a majority vote? The hon. Member for the Swansea District had said at the Conference that the Council would have nothing to do with the management of elementary schools, that it would have no power to deal with religious instruction or any of those matters which had been the subject of heated controversy in the last few years, and that there was nothing in the clause to give the Council the right in any way to interfere with the trust deeds or managers of any voluntary schools in Wales. To test these generous assurances he would only ask whether the Minister for Education was prepared to make himself responsible in the House for the conduct and decisions of the Welsh Council acting by a majority and constituted as was apparently contemplated by the Bill? Would anyone suggest that pandemonium would not follow in England, if for a permanent body like the Board of Education they were to substitute an elective body? What would be the difficulties of the House in connection with the Budget? There was another serious point to be considered, and that was the interests of those churches and schools in Wales which did not possess to-day any representation in the House. How far was the right hon. Gentleman prepared to accept Amendments with the view of securing the protection promised to them? Various questions of an administrative character presented themselves. It was all very well for the right hon. Gentleman to say in a spirit of very novel conciliation that he undertook to give protection for denominational teaching, and that none of their religious differences should go to the Council. But the Government had failed to see how perversive these religious differences were. Who, for instance, was to decide whether the schools were adequately staffed? He contended that such decision must rest with the Board of Education if denominational interests were to receive adequate protection. He would also like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it was proposed that the Council should be the judge as to whether an individual school was necessary or not, or was there to be an appeal on that point from the Council to the Board of Education? Again, in connection with training colleges under the Bill, it would apparently be in the power of the Welsh Council to sweep away the denominational character of training colleges altogether. Many Welsh churchmen were anxious to be informed whether the power to deal with these training colleges would be one of the powers devolving upon the Council or whether it would devolve upon the Board of Education. He would also like to be informed how the proposals of the Government would affect Section 15 of the Act of 1870. That stern sense of duty which led so many of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters into an unpleasant predicament under the Act of 1902 would still be active under the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There are no passive resisters in Wales.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said the right hon. Gentleman would concede that this was because their place had been taken by active resisters. Further, he wanted to know whether or not it was proposed in the future, assuming that the objections experienced by highly developed consciences against Clause 4 became troublesome, to apply constraint by the Board of Education or by the Council. The Education Authorities' Default Act had not been included in the schedule as being repealed by the present Bill. He apprehended that on the principle of setting a thief to catch a thief the Council would be empowered to exercise it at the expense of a recalcitrant member. The powers under the present Bill were of the greatest possible importance. There were the following most important appeals to the Board of Education and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would say whether those appeals would continue to be to the Board of Education, or would be assigned to the newly created Council. In the first place there was the approval of the arrangements under Clause 2, appeals under Paragraph (a) Subsection (1) of Clause 2; appeals and administrative action under Clause 4; regulations under public inquiries under Clause 13 (3); decision as to who were owners under Clause 13 (4); powers under the Government Amendments to enable the Board of Education to compel transfers under Clause 2. He wished to know whether the President of the Board of Trade had considered the constitutional difficulties which presented themselves. Were they going to perpetuate an appeal to the Board of Education on all those points? Under Article 10 of the Code the appellate tribunal was authorised to decide whether a new school was wanted, whether existing premises were suitable, or whether the existing schools ought to be continued. What was the administrative machinery which informed the appellate body? The only machinery of the kind was that very Board of Inspectors which they were going to destroy. What he wanted to know was how were they going to set up an appellate body in the shape of the Board of Education when they had taken away every source of information by the aid of which they could discharge their appellate function and without the constant presence of which they could not discharge those functions or any analagous functions in the future. They would be told that it was not necessary for them to assume that all those powers would not be exercised in anything but a charitable and considerate way towards minorities, and that it was malicious and petty to assume that the decisions of the Welsh Council would be actuated by bitter prejudice against the voluntary schools of Wales. If that objection was made they might reasonably ask, not in any spirit of bitterness, what was the position taken up by those very bodies who were now to constitute the new Council in Wales? What was the spirit shown by those bodies when they acted both separately and together during the last few years? They could not, for instance, forget a resolution which was moved at the Llandudno Conference of the North Wales Education authorities in 1902 by Mr. E. R. Davies in the following words—

> "That this Conference heartily commends the action of those local authorities which have warned the Government that they would decline to administer this unpopular and oppressive measure if forced upon the country, and that this Conference hopes this example will be followed generally by other authorities throughout the country."

If there was any single right which directly or indirectly placed the rights of denominational schools at the mercy of those who were responsible for this intolerant policy and who held this lawless and insolent language, then this proposal was impossible in any shape or form. They could not forget that the President of the Board of Trade himself in the course of that agitation, in May, 1903, moved a resolution to the effect that until the Education Act was amended Welsh Councils should refrain from applying rates to the support of all such schools. He submitted to the Committee that if that was the spirit which animated the shepherds of the people, some little apprehension might be felt in regard to the sheep, more especially in a fold in which the right hon. Gentleman would not be present. Conciliation to be persuasive must be a plant of mature growth and the right hon. Gentleman's antecedents exposed him to no little suspicion. With every desire to hear what the President of the Board of Trade had to say upon those suggestions, he claimed to have shown that the Government had not given that degree of attention to the administrative difficulties involved which the Committee had a right to demand. Nothing whatever, up to the present, had been placed before the Committee which would enable hon. Members to satisfy themselves that Parliament was retaining any direct or efficient control over the expenditure of public money by this new Council. Whilst the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade and those who agreed with him declared that they were anxious to protect the rights of minorities in Wales, the Government had not given the slightest indication of any contemplated action except by rhetorical eulogies of the quality of charity, and certainly they had not attempted to work out their pledges in detail. It would not be possible to develop those protective clauses in practice unless they reinforced the Board of Education by a staff of inspectors without the informative assistance of which the exercise of appellate duties was impossible. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

> In page 20, lines 16 and 17, to leave out the words "central education authority for Wales, to be called the council for Wales," and insert the words "consultative education committee under the Board of Education, to be called the Welsh Central Committee."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that perhaps the Committee would allow him to intervene at this stage of the debate. The hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool had reviewed the whole of this clause and its proposals, and it was an advantage that he had done so at the very outset, because that would enable him (Mr. Lloyd-George) to cover most of the ground and point out at once in what respects the Government were prepared to meet those criticisms. He would deal first of all with the historical part of the hon. Member's speech referring to the origin of the clause. He did not complain generally of the statement made by the hon. and learned Member, but he pointed out that at the time of the first conference, representative of all creeds, this clause was not in existence. The Bill had not been produced, and therefore he could not have said that the Cardiff conference was in favour of a Council for Wales. The hon. Member, however, was himself in favour of a council of this kind, provided that the administrative details were satisfactory. In that respect the hon. Member represented the vast majority of the Conservatives in Wales. He did not mean to say that every Conservative and every Churchman viewed with approval any sort of council. It would be too much to ask that there should be absolute unanimity in any country on any particular proposal; but here they had a representative conference at which were present two Anglican Bishops, two Roman Catholic Bishops and the majority of the Conservative candidates for Wales. A Resolution was unanimously passed in favour of a National Council for Wales to aid and supply education of all kinds, primary, secondary, and higher. The Resolution was carried in this form on the suggestion of the Bishop of St. David's. He did not think that any country could go further in the way of unanimity than Wales did upon that occasion. It was no doubt the case that there had been considerable exacerbation during the conflict of the last three or four years; but the remarkable zeal on the part of the Welsh people for educational efficiency induced this representative conference to meet and to pass this Resolution unanimously. As a Welsh Member and as a Member of the Government, all he asked was that the Committee should not thwart the unanimous desire of the Welsh people on this question, so that they might be able to meet hon. Members and others reasonably in matters wherein they had good ground for criticism. He would also point out that there were two powerful organs of Conservative opinion in Wales—the *Western Mail*—he did not think there was an abler paper in the whole country—and the *Swansea Post*, a halfpenny newspaper with a considerable influence. The two daily papers representing the Unionist Party in Wales supported this proposal. The first conference was held before the Bill had been prepared; but a second conference, representative of Welsh education authorities, was held in June, and expressed its approval of the establishment of a Welsh National Council for Education. The Resolution was proposed and seconded by supporters of the Conservative Party, and was carried with only four dissentients. That Resolution was moved by a Conservative and seconded by a Conservative, and had many Conservative supporters. That showed that this was not regarded as a political question in Wales. When the hon. and learned Member quoted from the speeches of his opponents he ought not to take half a sentence and leave the rest. The statement that the Cabinet would rejoice if the scheme were dropped was made to suggest, not that the Cabinet were opposed to the scheme, but that they were anxious not to overload their Bill. He had no doubt that those quotations were supplied to the hon. and learned Member, and therefore he was not altogether responsible for the imperfect condition in which they had been placed before the Committee. The hon. and learned Member was wrong in saying that in regard to intermediate education there was no autonomy in Wales. Autonomy was complete, and it had been an unqualified success. There was no country in Europe which had made such sacrifices for secondary education as Wales. Some Welsh counties had surpassed even Prussia, and in the matter of rating and voluntary contributions their grants in proportion were very much higher. Wales had rated herself more highly for primary education than Scotland. While in England the whisky money was used for a long time in relief of rates, the Welsh counties had applied the whole of the money to building up their system of secondary education. The result was that, while secondary education was in England largely a matter of class, in Wales 8,000 out of the 10,000 children in the secondary schools came from the elementary schools. Colleges like that at Bangor—to which there was no parallel in the poor districts of England—had been founded by the voluntary contributions of quarrymen and agricultural labourers. The country that was doing that had some claim to come to the House of Commons. He put forward this proposal for a Welsh Council frankly and sincerely on educational grounds. There was an idea that Wales wanted to set up some sort of infernal machine for the purpose of blowing up the last remnant of denominationalism. If that were done it would be done by means of the county councils. It was not the object of this proposal, he could assure the Committee. As long as educational powers were given to this National Council, he would prefer that no powers should be given by which the religious controversy could be introduced into the Council's deliberations. The success of the Welsh University colleges was attributable to the fact that the religious controversy had been kept out. Any power which would allow the Council to wrangle about religion would destroy its efficiency from the outset. He should welcome any help in eliminating the virus of this religious controversy from the system of Welsh education. As to criticisms of detail, the first Amendment dealt with the question of control. He was not afraid of control, and, if it was felt that real and effective Parliamentary control ought to be retained, he was perfectly willing to agree to Amendments with that purpose.

He could not accept the Amendment the hon. and learned Member had moved, because it reduced the Welsh Central Committee to a consultative body. They might cut down the functions of that body if they liked, but they should be administrative functions. He would be prepared to accept the principle of the hon. and learned Member's Amendment on the Paper, which provided that—

> "The President of the Board of Education shall be responsible to Parliament for any act of the Welsh Central Committee done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Committee under this section, and shall have full control over the Committee in respect of the exercise of such powers."

He accepted both of those conditions fully, but he did not think the responsible Minister should be the President of the Board of Education. He thought there ought to be a special Department dealing specially with this body. That would involve a considerable modification of the clause, and it would be a considerable concession to hon. Gentlemen opposite. It meant that there should be a Minister who would be answerable to the House for everything that was done by the Welsh Council in the exercise of its delegated powers, and who would have full control over that Council. He thought there would be no difficulty in appointing a special Minister with a special staff. He might be a Member of the present Ministry holding the office of junior Lord of the Treasury or some other office. The power he would have would be the power of the purse. He would be responsible for the grants. In regard to this matter there was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Blackpool, to provide that—

> "The Board of Education shall continue to have power to inspect during the hours allotted to secular instruction all Welsh schools in receipt of Parliamentary grants, and shall annually prepare and lay before Parliament a statement of the sum which, in the opinion of the Board of Education, it is desirable that Parliament should grant in respect of education and science and art in Wales."

That meant that the financial responsibility would rest upon this Minister. He could not accept the Amendment in this particular form. What he contemplated was that the Minister should have financial responsibility and financial control. He would also have power over the Code. The Code might be prepared by the Council, but it could only be passed by the Minister, and he would be responsible for it. In this regard the powers of the Council would be consultative. What the hon. Member wanted was that there should be complete responsibility vested in Parliament for this Code; that the Code should not be prepared by the Council, and that financial responsibility for it should not be vested in the Council. He thought that was a sound doctrine. After all, finance depended on the Code. It was quite clear that the Minister who was responsible to Parliament should not part with that power, and therefore he proposed to accept, on behalf of the Government, the substance of the Amendment, and to provide that the Minister should prepare annually this statement and prepare it on the basis of inspection and on the basis of the Code, for which he would have complete responsibility. With regard to the question of appeal, the hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool had catalogued the subjects on which he considered there ought to be an appeal from the Council in Wales to the Board of Education. He would like to know whether the hon. and learned Member's view was not modified by the fact that there would be a Minister responsible to the House. The hon. and learned Member had placed upon the Paper the following Amendment—

> "No power or duty of the Board of Education shall be transferred to the Welsh Council which affects denominational interests or religious disputes or, in particular, any of the following matters:—(1) The approval of the plans or site of any elementary school which it is proposed to take over under Section 5 of this Act; (2) the placing of any such school on the annual grant list under Article 27 of the Code; (3) any decision as to whether any such school or any transferred voluntary school is necessary under Article 29 of the Code; (4) the inspection of any transferred voluntary school and any decision as to whether any such school is maintained at a satisfactory level of efficiency, due regard being had to the condition of other schools in the area, or as to the compliance of such school with any articles of the Code relating to efficiency; (5) the decision of questions arising under Section 18 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, so far as they concern any transferred voluntary school; (6) the making of regulations for training colleges and secondary schools; (7) the making of a code of regulations for such public elementary schools as are transferred voluntary schools or State-aided schools—nor any power of control which the Board of Education shall exercise in respect

of State-aided schools, nor any power or duty of the Board of Education arising under Sections 2, 4, 13, Sub-sections 3 and 4, of this Act, nor any power or duty exercised by the Board of Education as successors of the Charity Commissioners, or otherwise in respect of educational charities."

In regard to sub-sections (1), (2), and (3), there was no appeal under the Bill in England, and therefore he did not see why there should be an appeal from the Welsh Council to the Board of Education. Sub-section (5) dealt with the question of unnecessary schools. That was an important matter. He quite understood that hon. Members opposite and their friends in Wales might not be disposed after the recent controversies to trust the Council to decide the question whether a voluntary school was a necessary school or not. He proposed, in a case of that sort, that the appeal should go to the Board of Education. With regard to facilities under Sections 2, 4, and 13 of the Bill, he quite admitted they could hardly ask that, at the present moment, hon. Members opposite should feel absolute confidence in matters of that sort in the Council; and, therefore, they agreed that in cases of that kind it would be desirable that the appeal should go straight to the Board of Education rather than to the new Council. There was a very good defence for such an appeal. In one instance prior to the last Act the salaries paid by the voluntary school managers amounted to £460, but after the Act these salaries were raised to £600, which was not a bad increase in the course of eighteen months. The religious bias had been introduced not by the parish councils but by the Board of Education. As to the question of a sufficient and suitable staff, surely that would not arise. If this Bill became an Act, there would be no voluntary schools. They would all be council schools, and all the teachers in future would be teachers of the council, and there was no reason, therefore, why they should cut down the staff of one school and increase it in another school. The hon. and learned Member did not seem to think that the Board of Education could very efficiently consider these appeals or administer its appellate jurisdiction after it had parted with so many of its powers to a Council in Wales. He did not see why that should be so at all. The only feeling he had got about the whole matter was this. They had been able to carry, he thought he might venture to say, 80 per cent. of the Churchmen and Conservatives of Wales with them in their attempt to set up some sort of local autonomy for primary education in Wales. These Churchmen and Conservatives, who had been devoting their lives to building up their primary and secondary education, were coming in to help them in this matter. They had appealed to the Government for these safeguards. The Government felt they had a right almost to demand them now that they had come in, and would co-operate with them. He felt it was better for them to get an inferior machine, with limited powers, which practically the whole of the people would work from the beginning with a whole heart, without any fear and without any suspicion, than to get a more perfect and more complete machine which half the population would regard only with distrust. That was the reason why, in response to the appeals made to them from Wales, and to the appeal which had been made so effectively by the hon. Member opposite on behalf of such large numbers in Wales who were not represented in the House, the Government were prepared to meet the case in the manner he had indicated.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that no one who had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman would deny that it was intended to smooth away difficulties and to conciliate opposition. He was not prepared to deny, without a much closer examination of the proposals than he had been able to give to them, that many of the fundamental objections which he had to Part IV. from the constitutional point of view had been modified by the announcement of the concession the Government were prepared to make. But that fact ought not to blind them to the extraordinary, the almost monstrous —certainly the unexampled—treatment which the Committee and the House had received from the Government, not now for the first time, and not in connection with this Bill alone, in regard to their powers of discussing great and vital changes. They were now working under extraordinary rules, devised for the purpose of this particular measure. If they had been in their ordinary condition of freedom, it would have been his duty, as Leader of the Opposition, to move to report progress, as far as this clause was concerned, in order that the Committee might have time to consider the changes which had been introduced. He was precluded, and the Government knew he would be precluded, from taking any such step on the present occasion. It was, then, incumbent upon the Government as guardians of their debates to give the Committee full notice of the proposals which they intended to make. The Government had had this clause before them for months, and they were perfectly familiar with the general character of the objections which the Opposition had to it in the shape in which it appeared in the Bill. Before the Second Reading he himself called public attention to the fact that the clause conferred administrative and legislative Home Rule on Wales. That was their first objection; and the Government knew the second objection they felt to the clause. Those who followed the action of the Welsh opponents and critics of the Bill of 1902, and not least that of the right hon. Gentleman who spoke to the Committee in such mellifluous accents just now, knew that they had gone beyond the verge of legality in their attempt to destroy, or to minimise, the effect of the Act of 1902. They were justified, therefore, in looking with the extremest suspicion upon any proposal which handed over to a Welsh central body powers to do legally that which these gentlemen had endeavoured to do illegally. The Government being fully seised of the two main objections they felt to the proposal, what was the manifest obligation upon them? Was it to wait until, under the closure, they had but a few hours to discuss the Bill and then to throw at their heads across the floor of the House—and not even in manuscript—a general idea of the Amendments they proposed to introduce? Was it not rather their bounden duty, at the very earliest moment, as soon as they had grasped the character of the Opposition's objections, and had made up their minds what they intended to do to meet those objections, to put down their Amendments on the clause, and let the Committee see how far the wishes of the Government and of the Opposition could really be made to harmonise on the basis of the policy now sketched out by the right hon. Gentleman? But that was not what they had done; what they had done was to allow the Committee to go on discussing the other clauses, to leave the Paper of Amendments absolutely innocent of the smallest hint or suggestion of what they were going to do, and then at the last moment, late in the afternoon of the day on which the closure fell on this clause, to announce a new policy which was not even hinted at in the clause, and with the air of conferring an enormous boon upon the House and country, the Committee in general and the Opposition in particular. If embodied in a Bill the new proposal would require a First and Second Reading and Committee stage; it would occupy long debates in the House, legitimately and necessarily and not under the closure or the highly artificial conditions under which the debates were now carried on. What was the new proposal? It was not merely to give a central authority in Wales for primary education, but for all sorts of education, and to create a new Ministry. The right hon. Gentleman talked in an airy way of some of his colleagues taking up the duties of this Welsh Minister. He did not know which members of the Cabinet had so leisured an existence that they could add to their duties the further duty of dealing with Wales. If the President of the Board of Trade were to be the Minister selected, he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman's duties were of so light a character that he could gladly add to them the superintendence of education in Wales, and of the necessary staff which would have to be created. Perhaps it was one of the able gentleman now in subordinate place to whom the duties would be allotted. However that might be, or whether the post was given to a new Minister created for this purpose, as he thought ought to be the case, it was an enormous change. It involved a new office, a new occupant of the Treasury bench, and the creation of a staff. He would not say a great staff, but an important staff, for the Minister would require skilled advisers and a body of inspectors, without whom he would be not the controlling spirit in dealing with Welsh education, but the mere servant and mouthpiece of the new Welsh authority. Was ever such a thing heard of in the whole history of the British Parliament as that, without notice, without preface, without offering any excuse, the Government should come down——

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: And accept Amendments moved by the Opposition.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Which Amendment is there about a Minister? The right hon. Gentleman's interruption was peculiarly infelicitous. Because, supposing one of his hon. friends behind had made that suggestion, the right hon. Gentleman knew very well that a suggestion made by a member of the Opposition acting on his own behalf and independently was not a sufficient notice to the Committee that a great constitutional change was going to be accepted by the Government. Therefore, even if one of his hon. friends had made this proposal, it would not diminish by an iota the gravity of the charge. But as a matter of fact no such Amendment was on the Paper. Never until the right hon. Gentleman got up had it been breathed that a new paid member of the Government, a new staff, a new office, and new duties were going to be set up for a portion of the United Kingdom, a new Minister dealing with Wales as a whole and with no other part of the United Kingdom. That, whether right or wrong, was a constitutional change of the utmost gravity and moment. And when they had got their Minister for Wales, did they think he was going to be confined to education? Did the Welsh Members want him to be confined to education? Of course they did not. He was not discussing the question of Home Rule at all, but this was the beginning, and he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would deny it, of a new system under which Wales was to bear the same relation to this House and to the other parts of the United Kingdom that Ireland or Scotland bore.

*COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) said they wished to avoid in Wales that very condition of Ireland—that was the object they had in view.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was talking, not of the hon. Gentleman's objects, but of the Government's plans. The plan of the Government, unquestionably and admittedly as far as education was concerned, and he thought potentially as far as other administrative work was concerned, was to put Wales in the same general relation with the United Kingdom as Scotland and Ireland were in now; in other words, with an administration of its own, dealing with its own affairs, responsible to this House—not, therefore, embodying the scheme of Home Rule, but entirely altering the *status* of Wales and its relations to the United Kingdom. That might be good or bad, it might commend itself to Welsh Members, and might not meet with violent opposition from British Members, but would any human being deny that it was a change of the utmost gravity, a new departure the magnitude of which it was almost impossible to foresee? Yet it was to be considered under the closure, without the direction of a First or Second Reading, without the country having been consulted, or even Parliament. Let them look at the Ministerial Benches; they were somewhat fuller now than when the right hon. Gentleman spoke, but still only scantily attended. It was in these circumstances that, without the smallest warning, this amazing statement of policy was made by the Government. The minor aspects of the right hon. Gentlman's speech he deliberately avoided touching on—the question whether the machinery provided for protecting the interests of minorities, and for safeguarding the interests of education was adequate or not. He took his stand and based his objection on the unexampled way in which the Government had treated the House on this question as a whole. Never before had such a proposition been made under such circumstances. It was thrown at their heads within five hours and a half of the moment when all discussions must cease, before a House of Commons which knew nothing of the proposal beforehand. That was a deliberate insult to the House, which no other Government in his recollection had ever dared to inflict.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): What about the last few years when you were in office?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Let the right hon. Gentleman interrupt. During the ast few years when I was Leader of the House, show me an instance in which I ever attempted in this way to check discussion. Show me a case in which I came down in the middle of a gagged Bill and told the House that they were to accept a new scheme for redistributing the governmental powers in connection with the constituent parts of the United Kingdom. No such parallel exists. Can the right hon. Gentleman tell me if there is one ?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There were changes in the Act of 1902 that were never even discussed at all—which were carried by the closure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I daresay there were, Sir.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: And a good many too.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not comparable to these changes.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Much worse.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not comparable to the changes you have already introduced without discussion. Did we take the Act of 1902 and make it the framework for remodelling the constitution of the British islands ? Did, the right hon. Gentleman went on to ask, the late Government make these great changes without giving any warning to the House at all, without giving notice of what they were going to do ? Never, never; no such precedent could be found either in the late Government or under any other Government. [An HON. MEMBER: Mr. Gladstone's.] Mr. Gladstone would have shuddered. He knew, of course, that they were helpless in the matter, not merely because they were a minority and a small minority, but because the Government had chosen to make this proposal under conditions which took from them even the ordinary Parliamentary weapons which a minority, however small, ordinarily possessed. The Government had them in their grasp, he granted it. But whether it was to the honour and credit of the House of Commons or whether the proper conduct of legislation in the future would be furthered by proceedings of this sort, he left it to the Gentleman who had interrupted him to consider carefully in his leisure moments. As far as he was concerned, he could do no more than enter his protest in the strongest manner in which it was competent for him to do.

*MR. ASQUITH said the right hon. Gentleman had sought, and successfully sought, to raise the temperature of a hot afternoon by a speech in which he ventured to say in all his experience he did not think he had ever seen an artificially engendered passion torn into more minute and infinitesimal tatters. And what was it all about ? "Such an insult," the right hon. Gentleman said, "had never before been offered to the House of Commons." He would try, if he could, to bring the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite back to the facts of the case. What was it that had excited the right hon. Gentleman so ? Did he really know what it was, and what the proposal was to which the Government had accepted this Amendment ? He talked about "gigantic constitutional changes sprung upon the House of Commons." What was the proposal ? It was to modify the plan of the Government, which had been before the House ever since this Bill was read a first time, in the direction of securing greater Parliamentary control. What was the proposal in the Bill ? He would read the first sub-section, which was more than hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to have done. It ran—

> "His Majesty's Government may, by Order in Council, establish a central education authority for Wales, to be called the Council of Wales."

He paused there to ask was that, or was that not, a proposal on the part of the Government to give to Wales in this matter the same kind of separate educational administrative control as now prevailed in Scotland and in Ireland, and which the right hon. Gentleman had just told them was now for the first time brought before Parliament ? Of course it was, and that was the proposal in the Bill itself—that was the original proposal put into the Bill, discussed fully at the Second Reading, and which had been before the House and the country all these weeks. Then what was the crime and the offence which had been committed by his right hon. friend ? The whole crime of his right hon. friend that afternoon was that he had accepted in substance an Amendment proposed by the Opposition [OPPOSITION cries of "No"] by a distinguished Member of the Opposition, in which he suggested that the President of the Board of Education should be responsible to Parliament for any act of, and should have full control over, the proposed Committee. His right hon. friend had accepted that Amendment with one single modification—namely, that instead of the Minister for Education, he suggested that some other Minister should be responsible. What, after all, did that come to? Was he not right in saying that the proposal of the Government in its original shape made a far more drastic change in the constitution than the one now suggested, because it set up the Council in Wales without any direct control? In the hope of making the proposal more acceptable to the Opposition, his right hon. friend had agreed that that Council should have a Parliamentary representative, who was to be a member of the Government and who was to have control over the Council. That concession—made with the hope of meeting criticisms, which he did not say were altogether without cause, that proceeded from the opposite side of the House, and of making the original scheme of the Government more in consonance with the views of the House at large—put forward by his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade was that which had excited all this hysterical indignation. He really thought the Committee might now bring themselves back to consider the actualities of the situation. The Government were prepared to consider and to give due weight to any reasonable criticism of this modification—a modification suggested by hon. Gentlemen opposite and accepted by the Government to meet such objections as they might conscientiously entertain. The clause as originally presented to the House contained everything that was constitutionally new, and in a much more accentuated form. Therefore it was idle to suggest that the Government had taken advantage of the procedure by closure in order to spring upon the House and the Statute-book a proposal of this kind.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said he thought that if the right hon. Gentleman had been present a little earlier and had heard what had been said he would hardly have spoken as he had. They were now discussing quite a different clause from that printed on the Paper and it did not bear any relation to the Amendment of his hon. friend. What was the proposal of the clause? It was to transfer the whole of the duties of the Board of Education so far as Wales was concerned to a Council for which no one was responsible in this House, for whose expenditure nobody was responsible, and for whose action no man here or elsewhere could be held responsible. They were now discussing something perfectly different. It was now proposed that the Council for Wales should be advised by a new inspectorate, and be represented in the House of Commons by a Minister. Who was to be that Minister? They were left quite in the dark. Was the Minister to be a Lord of the Treasury? Was a Lord of the Treasury to deal with the whole question of education in Wales? What was the relation of the Minister to the Council? Was the Minister to have any control over the Council? Could he say to the Council "I will not be responsible for these proposals," and in that case would the matter come to a standstill? Was there to be an appeal to the Board of Education over his head? They were told that under certain circumstances an appeal was to lie to the Board of Education. He had never heard of a more crude suggestion than this, except the clause itself as it stood in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said he proposed to eliminate the religious difficulty from the purview of the Council. But the Council or the local authorities must deal in some form or other with the schools taken over under Clause 4. It was well known how Welsh local authorities in the past had treated voluntary schools. In Merioneth they had refused to repay to managers charges incurred in order to supply the necessaries of the school; in Montgomery they had refused to pay the salaries—actually earned—of the teachers; in Barry they refused to place a Roman Catholic on anything like the same level, as to staff, as the council schools. Therefore, how could the right hon. Gentleman possibly say that all denominational trouble would be removed from the Council and the local authority when they must consider the taking over by them of voluntary schools and the granting of facilities for religious instruction? The right hon. Gentleman had now made a conciliatory speech, but what did he urge upon the Welsh county council when the Defaulting Authorities Act first came into operation? That the whole of the children in Wales should be turned into the streets and that elementary education should be brought to a standstill. That was very warmly and firmly advocated by the right hon. Gentleman in the first days of the Defaulting Authorities Act, and under those circumstances how could the Committee have any confidence in the clause as it now stood or in the assurances of the right hon. Gentleman when those assurances could only be made effective by a crude scheme such as this involving a complete constitutional change in the administration of Welsh education, a scheme which was not even now set down on the Order Paper for their consideration? And yet they were told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had heard nothing of the debate, that they were spurning the conciliatory efforts of the Government. His (Sir William's) experience of the House had not been long, but he had never seen such serious proposals brought forward in such a haphazard manner—proposals to which the supporters of the Government paid so little attention and for which they cared so little, as the deserted state of the benches on the Ministerial side of the House made plain.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) said he had listened very carefully to the statement of the President of the Board of Trade, and he understood there were to be gathered from it three important matters. They were to have a new Minister in this House with a new department. They were to have a recasting of this clause with a view to allocating certain matters to the new Minister of the new department, and to retaining certain matters, as he understood, in the Board of Education as they at present existed, or in the Board of Education in conjunction with the new Council. He did not know exactly how that was to be worked out. Everyone must see that it was an important change in the clause. The clause itself was a clause of devolution. The proposals that were now made, however, if devolution at all, were in a modified form, and were to be under a department in connection with this House. No one could deny that all these were important matters. Their complaint was that not a single one of these Amendments was on the Paper, and they were not able to say what the effect of them would be, or how far they modified the objections to the clause. The Committee had only four and a half hours left for discussion. Would the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade even now hand across the floor of the House a copy of the Amendments the right hon. Gentleman himself proposed to move, or the Amendments to the Amendments which he said he would wholly or partially accept? Without having the proposals of the Government on paper was it not a farce to continue the discussion? He did not believe the Government had one Amendment ready, because he could not imagine that, having regard to Parliamentary usages, they would not allow the Opposition to have copies of them. What was the Committee to go on discussing?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Amendments on the Paper.

SIR E. CARSON said the right hon. Gentleman had told them he was going to propose Amendments of his own. Might he ask when he proposed to put down these Amendments?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was proposed to follow the usual Parliamentary procedure. He had indicated the Amendments on the Paper which he would accept in a modified form, but which he accepted substantially. When they came to the Amendments they would be able to say exactly what the course would be.

SIR E. CARSON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman thought that was quite candid. Did he really think it was a mere nominal Amendment that instead of providing that the President of the Board of Education should be responsible to Parliament for the acts of this Welsh Council they were going to set up a new Minister and a new department?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he never said a department. What he said was that in substance they accepted the Amendments of the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool and the hon. Member for Blackpool. The substance, in his opinion, was Parliamentary control. In his view the substance of the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool was that first of all there should be a Minister responsible to this House, and secondly that that Minister should have complete control. The Government accepted these two points, which they considered to be the substance. The only difference between them was as to whether the Minister was to be a Minister *ad hoc* or not. With that difference he would accept the Amendment.

SIR E. CARSON said the worst of it was that they could not put the substance of a thing into a Bill. They must put the specific words. They must know whether this was to be a Minister *ad hoc*, or whether the work was to be mixed up with some other department. As he understood, this Minister was to have complete control over this new Council. But under what provisions? Were there to be no provisions in the Bill at all to show how that control was to be exercised? Were they willing that the Minister should exercise control without specifying how? Was the right hon. Gentleman simply going to put in the Bill "and shall have full control over the committee?"

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: "And shall have full control over the committee in respect of the exercise of such powers."

SIR E. CARSON said he failed to see how the Minister was going to exercise control, but it would make him a very much more important Minister. In addition, they were delegating to the Minister a number of other powers. Were they going to set up the financial Resolution that was necessary? The financial Resolution which had been passed by the House merely covered the grant for the local education authority for the elementary schools. It was absolutely impossible to discuss these matters unless the right hon. Gentleman told them more specifically what he proposed to do. It ought to be on paper, so that they might consider and discuss the matter. He did not suppose anyone could say what the exact division of powers between the Welsh Council and the Board of Education was to be. They had now come to a state of confusion —he might almost say of anarchy—in Parliamentary proceedings which was absolutely unparalleled. It would be impossible to discuss in anything like a satisfactory manner proposals of such vital importance.

MR. F. E. SMITH said it would be a rather unreal performance if he were to move the Amendment on which the Committee was nominally engaged for the moment until they had seen the words which the President of the Board of Trade was prepared to submit to the Committee. Was it of any use discussing his Amendment except on general lines until then? Perhaps after some reasonable interval the right hon. Gentleman would be able to furnish the Committee with the words in writing.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Gentleman probably knew all about the details of the negotiations that had been going on upon this subject. The Government were not altogether responsible for the delay in putting these words on the Paper. They were perfectly satisfied with the clause as it stood; and the only Amendments which the Government had indicated to-day as those which they were prepared to accept were in the nature of concessions to hon. Gentlemen opposite. The leaders of the Conservative Party in the Church of England in Wales have been very anxious to get guarantees and safeguards upon this particular point. The Government had asked them to formulate their demands, and had told them over and over again that they were prepared to consider them, but notwithstanding this they had never been able to induce them to do so. The hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool had put down an Amendment and the Government had accepted it, and with regard to his second Amendment he had already told the hon. and learned Member that they were prepared to accept that as well. Personally he had always been opposed to the Government treating the Bill as if every line of it was sacred and must not be altered. In Committee they ought to consider what could be accepted and how the Bill could be put into better shape. For making these concessions he had been told it was an insult to the House to do so. The

Government were prepared to accept the substance of the Amendment at the bottom of the page, and also the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Blackpool.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said that the Committee would perhaps allow him to say a few words with reference to the attitude of the Nationalist Members on this question. He thought anyone who had listened to the debate and the vast amount of details which were being dealt with must find in it the strongest possible argument for the principle of devolution. Upon such a question as that dealt with by the Bill, closure by compartments was necessary and inevitable, on account of the morbid condition of business in Parliament and the morbid state of the House. So far as the general policy of the Government was concerned, Nationalist Members were in favour of the policy of devolution. Therefore they took up no position of unfriendliness towards the proposal to create a local body in Wales to have control of such local business as education. Apart from the historic position of Ireland upon this question, they did not forget that in regard to the Irish demands for the application of a similar principle in Ireland they had found no more ardent supporters than the representatives of the people of Wales. For all these reasons it would be quite impossible for the Nationalist Party to take up any position of hostility to the principle of this clause. When various measures in the past had been brought before the House for giving the control of local affairs to Ireland they had always been based upon the fact that there was an overwhelming majority of people of one opinion in Ireland, and a small minority to whom safeguards were granted to protect their religious and political liberties. To proposals of this kind they had always given a full and cordial assent. He thought his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade had met the objections to this Council for Wales very fairly. The Catholics as well as the Anglicans in Wales were in a minority, and they were grateful to find some safeguards for the protection of those minorities in Wales, and they had been given in no grudging spirit. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to have met in a very candid, fair and generous spirit all the demands made for the protection of minorities, either Anglican or Catholic, in Wales. He suggested that the Government should choose as the representative of the Welsh Council somebody at present outside their own ranks. He understood that practically there had been reserved all those questions which were really dividing creeds in Wales. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."] He understood from what the President of the Board of Trade had said that such questions as really divided the sects and religious communities in Wales were not questions which this Welsh Council would be allowed to deal with. Under those circumstances how could Ireland do anything but welcome the carrying out of such a principle in Wales? Ireland had had grave reason for dissatisfaction in regard to some of the proceedings connected with education in the past, but those acts of violence were done in a state of war and as part of a plan of campaign. Now that the Nonconformists had received what they considered satisfaction for their grievances he hoped a better and more tolerant spirit would prevail in the future.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he wished to emphasise what was the actual truth in regard to this clause, namely, that its only object was an educational one. The Leader of the Opposition and other speakers had referred to this clause as being something new which had been sprung upon the country and the House of Commons at a few weeks notice. He thought it was right that the House of Commons should be made aware that so far as Wales was concerned the principle of this clause had been before them for a great many years, and that at election after election it was one of the questions which had been placed in the fore-front of their political programme. For a quarter of a century there had been a very strong desire in Wales to have such a council established. Reference had been made to a particular school in Denbighshire. Without going into any details it had been implied that the education committee of Denbighshire had been actuated by unfair motives in regard to the standing of that school, and that it would not be safe to grant the powers which this clause proposed to confer. The question of that school was under the consideration of the Board of Education, and he had every confidence that when the facts were inquired into by an inspector an arrangement satisfactory to both sides would be arrived at. From a personal knowledge of the facts he could say that the education committee had been actuated all along by reasons of educational efficiency. He protested against these cases being brought before the House of Commons without an intimate acquaintance with the local facts. What the people of Wales wanted was to unify Welsh education. If this clause passed, by whom was that work to be done? It was to be done by the men who had for many years been selected by the various county councils in Wales for the express purpose of carrying out the work of education in the Principality. He thought it would be admitted by those who had an expert knowledge of Welsh education that there was not an instance in the whole country of men who had done more, and who had sacrificed more time and labour during the last fifteen or twenty years, than those who, when this Welsh Council was established, would desire to bring home more directly to the people of Wales responsibility for the work of education in the future. He was glad the President of the Board of Trade had expressed the willingness of the Government to agree to certain Amendments, which would make Parliamentary control in the matter of the grants absolutely efficient. There seemed to be an idea in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite that the money was not in any way contributed by the people of Wales. The Committee ought to remember that Wales at all events contributed her share of the Parliamentary grants. If inquiry were made into the incidence of the taxation of Wales he thought it would be found that in many respects the people of the Principality, poor as they were, paid more than they ought to be called upon to pay to the Imperial Treasury. All that the people of Wales asked was that, subject to the absolutely adequate control of Parliament, the Council should have the distribution of the education fund in the Principality. He regretted exceedingly that heat should be introduced into the discussion of this momentous clause so far as Wales was concerned. What they really desired was educational efficiency; they wanted to lift the education of their children out of the rut of sectarian and religious controversy. They saw in this Council the possibility of bringing together to the discharge of this great educational work all classes and all creeds in the community. They had behind them to-day a united Parliamentary representation — something unparalleled in the Parliamentary annals of the country. If this matter could be treated in the spirit in which it ought to be treated, and if the people of Wales were given an opportunity of working out their educational salvation through this clause, he believed that a new chapter would begin in the educational history of Wales.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he felt some difficulty in intervening in this debate, because he had a considerable feeling at the back of his mind that the Committee were really not at one as to the way in which the question of legislation ought to be approached at all. The clause they were now discussing appeared to be drafted from the point of view that if they laid down in general terms certain principles of legislation the details were of comparatively small importance. Personally he took a precisely opposite view; he thought it was the details that really mattered. A body of men could be collected representing all sections in the House, who would be able to agree on general principles on almost every conceivable topic, and if the principles were made sufficiently general there would not be any difference of opinion at all. The President of the Board of Trade had made a good deal of the Welsh approval; he relied very much on the conferences which had been called, but it was now admitted that no details were submitted to the conferences at all. Only general principles were submitted, and as stated they excited very little opposition. He could understand that the working out of the details would mean a very different thing. The hon. Member for West Denbighshire had talked a great deal about "educational efficiency" and "Parliamentary control," phrases which carried great and deserved weight in this assembly, but he had not condescended to any particulars as to how Parliamentary control was to be established or educational efficiency promoted by the clause. The President of the Board of Trade had accepted the principle of certain Amendments in regard to Parliamentary control, but he had not told the Committee what form the Parliamentary control was to take. They did not know whether the Government were going to make any Amendments on the clause at the present stage or not. All they knew was that the right hon. Gentleman in going through the Amendments singled out two with which, speaking generally, he agreed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Three.

LORD R. CECIL: Three. He would take two as examples. The right hon. Gentleman had accepted the principle of the following Amendment, of which the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool had given notice—

> "Provided that the President of the Board of Education shall be responsible to Parliament for any act of the Welsh Central Committee done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Committee under this section, and shall have full control over the Committee in respect of the exercise of such powers."

What exactly did that mean? Did it mean in point of fact that the President of the Board of Education or the new Welsh Minister was to defend the policy of education in Wales, in the same way as the President of the Board of Trade defended the policy of the Government with reference to trade, or did it mean something different? If it meant that the Minister was to have full control he could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman did not accept the Amendment now before the Committee, which would make the Welsh Council a consultative committee. That was all it could be if the Minister was really to have the control and direction of policy, subject to any advice he might receive from the Welsh Committee. If this Welsh Minister was not to have complete direction, then Parliamentary control was gone. He earnestly protested against the Committee having to discuss those important legislative proposals without any certainty as to what they were, and without seeing them in print. One of the Amendments showed the impossibility of separating the denominational question from all other questions connected with education. Under these circumstances it was little better than a farce to go on with the discussion of this clause until they had the exact and definite words of the Government Amendments, so that they might be able to see whether the objects they had in view were carried out.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.) congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the manner in which he had introduced this question of an educational council for Wales, and also hon. Gentlemen opposite on the manner in which the proposal had been received. He could assure hon. Members opposite that their friends in Wales were not at all apprehensive of the possible action of this Welsh Council, and that there was great unanimity on the question amongst all Welsh people; he believed it would do much to dissipate the bitter feeling of the past, and bring about a better understanding amongst all classes. He was very glad to say, on behalf of the Party he represented, that the suggested new clauses were satisfactory to them; and he trusted that they would give the same satisfaction to the noble Lord opposite, and the hon. Members surrounding him. At any rate, in his opinion, the proposal of the Government would do some good to the cause of education in Wales.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would like to suggest that they were still engaged in a Second Reading discussion, and that they had only four hours left for the consideration of the Amendments. That was not too much in which to revolutionise the constitution of Wales.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that he had to the fullest extent sympathy with hon. Members from Wales in their hopes that the changes proposed by the Bill would lead to the advance of education in the Principality or to the cessation of the bitterness of partisanship. But he was afraid that he could not share the confidence of these hon. Members as regards the probable results of such administrative changes, or the advantages of the scheme of devolution proposed. Members like himself were placed in a difficult position by the course of the Government. They had come to the House prepared to criticise the proposals of the Bill, which amounted to a scheme of devolution. They found many reasons to object to that scheme. It provided no safeguard for the maintenance of Parliamentary authority: for the approval of the Code: for the audit of public money: for the sanction of loans pledging the public credit: and for the prevention of mal-administration of public funds. It might seriously interfere with the rights of teachers by confining them to a narrow area. It comprised together two essentially different things, central and local administration. But the proposal of the President of the Board of Trade was something entirely different. It amounted to the appointment of a Minister for Wales, who was to have some sort of control over the proceedings of this Welsh Council. This was a fanciful and an unworkable scheme, and it proposed a great constitutional change with altogether inadequate consideration. He contended that no effective control could be exercised over the central body in Wales by a Minister at Whitehall. He would like to know what were the views of the Chief Secretary for Ireland as to the control which he could exercise over a similar Board in Ireland. It was for that reason that he wished to hear the full views of the President of the Board of Education on this question. What was the reason for the refusal of the right hon. Gentleman to accept the responsibility for the acts of this council? Was it not because he was aware that he would have a heavy responsibility, but no effective control? The fact was that the new proposal was one which had been quite insufficiently considered, which was both unconstitutional and unworkable, and which had been thrust upon them in an unintelligible form. He could not understand the comments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Surely the indignation of the latter right hon. Gentleman was justified. What previous enactments had they to guide them in regard to legislation in this matter? In Scotland, where although the system of education had been based on a separate series of statutes for three centuries, yet they never had a separate Minister for Scotland till the year 1885, and then it was only after a Bill had been before Parliament for years, and the arrangement was only brought about by the complete agreement of both Parties. The Bill was brought into this House by a Conservative Ministry, but it was managed in the House of Lords there by Lord Rosebery, who was not a member of the Government at all. The Government, however, proposed to establish a Minister for Wales not by an Act of Parliament, but by a side wind upon an afternoon four hours before the closure fell, and at the instance of a Minister who did not give the words of his proposal by which he meant to alter the constitution of the country.

Mr. F. E. SMITH said that after the discussion which had taken place and the assurances which had been given, he thought he should be acting in accordance with the wish of the Committee if he withdrew his Amendment in order to give time for the discussion of other important Amendments.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON submitted an Amendment which he said embodied the proposal brought forward by the late Government, and which he said would make this Council or Committee precisely correspond to the Joint Committee which was proposed by the late Government and accepted by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade as an adequate representation of the local authorities in Wales. He should like to know whether the President of the Board of Trade would consent to the Committee being enlarged as he suggested.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 17, to leave out from the word 'the,' to end of sub-section, and to insert the words 'local education authorities under Part I. of the Education Act, 1902, and boroughs and urban districts having powers under section three of the same Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words down to 'any' in line 18 stand part of the clause."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought that if the hon. Baronet was more fully acquainted with the conditions of Wales he would find that the words as they stood in the Bill would work very much better than those which he proposed. He understood that the hon. Baronet wanted to represent areas of 10,000 inhabitants, but there were difficulties in the way in regard to counties, in regard to North and South Wales, and in regard to rural and urban areas which they had considered, and if they gave representation to all the areas with a population of 10,000, they would find it absolutely impossible to give a fair representation to the agricultural parishes. He thought that the hon. Baronet would agree that it was important that those parishes should be well represented on this council. They did not want the urban areas to be over-represented, and it was in order to secure that object that the words had been introduced into the clause.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. F. E. SMITH moved to insert the words, "Provided that the President of the Board of Education shall be responsible to Parliament for any act of the Welsh Central Committee done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Committee under this section, and shall have full control over the Committee in respect of the exercise of such powers." The hon. Member said that in his previous speech he had indicated the nature of the Amendment so he would not enlarge upon it. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had not replied to a consequential Amendment to the one he was now moving, which proposed, at line 25 of the clause, after "representatives," to insert "and that regulations shall be made by the Board of Education whereby the minority of each of the constituent local authorities shall appoint to the Council a number of representatives bearing the proportion of one to three to the number appointed by the majority of that authority." In order to elicit the right hon. Gentleman's views on the point, he therefore moved the present Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 20, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided that the President of the Board of Education shall be responsible to Parliament for any act of the Welsh Central Committee done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Committee under this section, and shall have full control over the Committee in respect of the exercise of such powers.'"—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that, as he had already indicated, he proposed to accept the substance of this Amendment, and he would now point out the way in which he proposed to deal with it. It was not his fault that he could not state his views till twenty minutes to seven, but it was the result of the action of the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the evening, who had sought to inflame the passions of the House. He proposed to move to amend the Amendment and to make it read, "The Order in Council shall provide for the appointment by His Majesty of a Member of Parliament, whether a Member holding office under the Crown or not, who shall be responsible for any act of the Welsh Council done in the exercise of any of the powers of the Board of Education delegated to the Council under this section, and shall have full control over the Council in respect of the exercise of such powers."

THE CHAIRMAN suggested that the Amendment should be withdrawn and that the Amendment as it was proposed to be amended should be placed before the Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR approved of the suggestion. The Government was altering the constitution of the country in which had to be dealt with by the Minister in Parliament. Had any preparation been made for a permanent staff in this matter? He would like to know what would be the relations of this Minister to the Board of Education. Was there to be a complete severance between the system of education in England and that in Wales? He wanted to hear something from the President of the Board of Education, who must have more experience than the President of the Board of Trade or the Solicitor-General on these points. Had the Minister for Education considered how this proposal would bear on the general scheme of education and the work of his Office, when his Department had a considerable and sometimes exciting branch cut off from it and handed over to another Minister. Again, had the President of the Board of Trade decided with what Department of the Government this new Department should be connected? He would ask whether there was any precedent for this mode of appointment, how the Minister representing Welsh education would be connected with the Council for which he was to be responsible to the House of Commons, what would be his relations, if any, to the Board of Education, and with what Department of the Government he was to be connected?

SIR W. ROBSON said the hon. Baronet had contended that the mode of appointment now suggested was unknown to the law. What was the suggestion? It was that the Minister it was proposed to bring into being should be appointed by Order in Council under the authority of this Bill. It was quite true that it was not usual to appoint a Minister by Order in Council; but if they authorised by Act of Parliament the appointment of a Minister by Order in Council, they needed no precedent. Parliament was able to do that as it was able to do other things. They were proceeding in the ordinary way by creating powers and indicating how an appointment was to be carried out, namely, by Order in Council. They were exercising a normal power properly exercisable by Parliament. The hon. Baronet had asked a number of questions which seemed to him appropriate to the Order in Council, but by no means requiring development now. This Minister, whether he had a salary or not, would have a Department. If he had a salary, it would come before Parliament on the Estimates. But that was not the only means by which Parliament could exercise authority. The Council which it was proposed to set up must have funds, and those funds must pass through Parliament. Therefore, Parliament would have the most effective of all means of exercising control. They would have the means of stopping the money. In these circumstances it did not seem necessary to put into an Act of Parliament all those details which were more appropriate to the Order in Council.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) ventured to think that the House had never in the whole course of its history been confronted with a situation which offered any parallel to the proceedings of the Government this afternoon. They were taking a departure for which there was no precedent. For centuries Parliament had regarded with jealousy any inovation in the framework of our Parliamentary constitution, and now, during the last stages of a Bill dealing with education, they were asked to make a change which had never been contemplated before, and which had not been explained to them to-day. The Solicitor-General got up to reply to the very pertinent questions put by his right hon. friend the Member for Oxford University, but had he given an answer to any of them? He had said that there was no precedent for the appointment of a Minister by Order in Council. Though it was within the prerogative of the Crown to create a new office in theory, as a matter of constitutional practice the prerogative was not used for that purpose except on the advice of the responsible Ministers of the Crown; in fact, on the advice of the Cabinet with the knowledge and concurrence of the Prime Minister. The Crown could create a new office provided there was no necessity for spending money on the department. According to "Dodd" it rested with the Government exclusively to determine whether any such changes were necessary in order to secure greater efficiency of the public service, and "they are effected by Order or Declaration in Council, an Act of Parliament being required only in cases where it is necessary to make pecuniary provision for the duties to be undertaken by the new Department." Did the argument of the Solicitor-General really mean that Amendments handed across the Table in manuscript, after two or three hours of pertinent inquiry as to the intention of the Government, were the kind of legislation contemplated by the sentence he had read? When an Act of Parliament was required, Ministers should introduce a Bill creating the new department. An Amendment could not be slipped in when dealing with legislation of a totally different character. The action of the Government was not only unconstitutional but illegal, because he did not believe a new department could be brought into being without a Resolution authorising the necessary expenditure. The Government was throwing all constitutional practice to the wind, and departing from all the financial control of the House at the instance of Ministers who had ventured to declare the intention of the Government only after having been subjected to severe cross-examination. Let it not be assumed that the anxiety they on the Opposition side felt with regard to this matter was assumed. Whether this Bill passed into law or not might be very important, but it was more important that they should not treat with levity so great a departure from constitutional practice as the creation of a new department in this way. The Government did not even tell them the nature of the new department which was to be created by this novel, unconstitutional, and illegal method. The Committee were told vaguely that in certain circumstances estimates would be necessary and Parliament would be able to criticise those estimates. That was a totally novel view of the bond which attached a Minister to this House and of the responsibility which rested upon him. It was a part of the Constitution that no Minister should take office unless he had real control and was in fact, as well as in name, the responsible party. By this proposal they were striking at one of the foundations of the constitution. The whole edifice of the constitution was built upon the real responsibility of the Cabinet and the personal responsibility of each Minister. It was a part of the Constitution that no Minister should take office unless he had real control. Was this new Minister to have control over all the actions of the Council, or was he not?

MR. BRIDGEMAN said the Committee had been informed hat a salaried department would be created under the new Minister. He asked whether, in view of the ruling already given, it was now in order to move or further discuss this Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was not proposed to create a new staff. At the present time the Board of Education looked after Wales. The officials appointed for that purpose would still have to do their work, and would be taken over for the purpose. The question was simply one of organisation. No new officials would be appointed, and there would be no additional expenses.

*THE CHAIRMAN did not think the Amendment which was the real question for his consideration made any fresh charge or raised any point on account of which he could rule it out of order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that a new department would not cease to be a new department because it was manned by old officials. The proposal of the Government was to transfer certain officials of the Board of Education and constitute them a separate department under a new minister. That was not denied. There would be a body of subordinate officials all owing allegiance to a single Parliamentary chief. That would be a new office. He believed such a new office could not be constituted by Order in Council. An Act of Parliament would be necessary for the purpose, and such an office could not be constituted by this Act of Parliament. The constitution of the office involved expenditure, but under the Resolution of the House he did not believe they could do anything except provide money to be distributed among the local education authorities. How was provision to be made for the payment of the new staff? Was the Minister for Education going to respond for estimates which referred to persons under someone else's orders? The Education Estimates for England were going to be diminished by this amount and a new set of estimates would be constituted for Wales, and the office in connection with them would be a new office. That new system could not, in his judgment, be established without an Act of Parliament. He was, however, really more concerned with the unexplained position of the new Parliamentary Minister. He put a good many questions to the President of the Board of Trade before the law officers of the Crown came in, but he would venture to repeat them. He would like to know whether the Minister appointed would vacate his seat upon appointment. For his own part he believed it would be necessary for him to seek re-election. The greatest change that ever took place in our constitutional history was that of making every Minister responsible for the acts of every other Minister, and making the Cabinet responsible for the policy of any one of its members. He also desired to know whether the new Minister would be a responsible Minister in the sense in which we understood that term. Would the Cabinet be responsible for his action? Would he consult the Cabinet on any question of importance? Then it appeared that the Minister in charge of Welsh education was to have no salary in that capacity. He had listened with astonishment to the *dictum* of the President of the Board of Trade that it did not matter whether the Minister had a salary or not, because what was attacked was not his salary, but the estimates he presented. Where did the right hon. Gentleman get that constitutional doctrine? Would anyone deny that if any other Government but this had suggested such a proposal it would have been denounced as the greatest and most scandalous innovation? Was there anything more utterly opposed to constitutional principles as understood by the Liberal Party? When the House criticised the action of the Welsh Education Department it would be necessary to challenge the salary of some permanent official who was not responsible. If the Government were going to destroy that boast of the British Constitution, the doctrine of Cabinet responsibility, and its strict application through all departments, they would have done a great deal of work in their first session.

SIR W. ROBSON said that, in replying to the first question which had been put to him, and speaking from recollection, he should say that whether or not this Minister would vacate his seat would depend upon whether or not his office was one of profit. Unless the Office was one of profit, the Minister would not have to vacate his seat. There was no limit whatever to the power of the Crown to create offices to which no profit was attached. The next question was whether this new Minister was to be a responsible Minister. In what sense was "responsible" used? The responsibility of every Minister now sitting on the Treasury bench was really the responsibility of the Cabinet. In that sense, of course, this Minister would be a responsible Minister. It was not salary that made a Minister responsible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can quite understand the answer of the hon. and learned Gentleman on that point. I wish to know how that tallies with the statement of the President of the Board of Trade that the position of this Minister would be analagous to that of the Gentleman who so ably responds in this House for the Charity Commissioners?

SIR W. ROBSON replied that even the Gentleman who responded for the Charity Commissioners had a certain responsibility. He was not a member of the Ministry, certainly, or his responsibility would be more marked. The Order in Council would reply to a great many of the questions which were now put forward as though they were constitutional difficulties. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had said that either this Minister must have a salary or somebody must act for him or under him who should receive some remuneration which could be put upon the Estimates, and he asked what provision had been made in the Estimates. Nothing would be done this year, and no financial provision need be made until next year, when it would be put upon the Estimates in the ordinary way. This was a question very largely of departmental reorganisation, and not new work. It was work which in a large measure had been done previously. The clerks who had done it were there, and would probably go on doing the work. Some new expenditure would probably grow out of this new departmental reorganisation. He never knew a reform yet which did not involve expenditure, and even expenditure greater than that which it was supposed to reduce. He was surprised at the language used by the right hon. Member for Dover, who spoke as if the foundations of the Constitution were at stake. Looking at this humble and modest measure of departmental reorganisation, it did not strike him personally as going quite so deep down to the foundations of our Constitution as certain suggestions he could remember about "co-ordination."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON observed that at the beginning of the session a discussion arose which involved the question whether the vacation of office depended on salary, and it was established that an office might be vacated although no salary attached to it.

SIR W. ROBSON said the discussion referred to was in regard to an office of profit, although no salary was taken.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it was a question whether an office was held "of the Crown" or "under the Crown. The question had not been answered. What were to be the relations of this new Minister with the Board of Education. Here was another gap in the Government proposal. They proposed to create another department—a Welsh department—and they proposed to transfer to that department the duties and officers of the present Board of Education. Could they do that without statutory authority? When some of the duties and staff of the Charity Commission were transferred to the Board of Education provision was made for this in the Act of 1899. What did the Minister for Education think of the transfer of Welsh education to another Department?

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) observed that what was certain was that the broad policy of this section had been adopted not only by this Government, but by the late Government. It was quite right that educational affairs in Wales should be treated in Wales by a Welsh body. The section they were now discussing did not pretend to give the details of the whole arrangement, but merely asked the Committee to give statutory authority for the creation of that body. He would remind the Leader of the Opposition that in April, 1887, the appointment was made of a Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Ireland, and Colonel King-Harman was appointed by the present Member for the City of London. The appointment of Colonel King-Harman was an appointment made, not only without statutory authority, but without the consent of Parliament at all. The present Lord Privy Seal, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton, attempted to raise the question on the Civil Service Estimates, and the Chairman said he did not think it would be appropriate to raise that question. Then the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I bow, of course, to your ruling, Sir; but as the right hon. Gentleman, the First Lord of the Treasury has attempted to justify the appointment, I wished to enter a protest on that point. I will not pursue the matter one sentence further. I should have been glad of another opportunity of saying that I consider that the creation of any new office under the Crown, whether or not its acceptance involved the vacating of a seat in this House—for I do not lay stress on that point—without the consent of Parliament is unconstitutional."

That was an appointment made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite; and it appeared in the course of the debate that great complaint was made with reference to the position of the hon. Gentleman who had been so appointed. This was what his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo said in the same debate in reply to the then Leader of the House—

> "The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury distinctly stated that the chief object of calling the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) to the position he now occupies was, that he should assist the Government with his knowledge of Ireland and with his advice in modelling great measures to be laid before Parliament. In my ears that was a most ominous declaration, because it amounted to this, that not only were we, in the future, to look to the influence of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Thanet Division of Kent in the administration of the law in Ireland, but even in the shaping of Irish legislation he was to be behind the scenes. Having that in my mind, there are certain things that have occurred in Ireland quite recently, which, in

view of these facts, are exceedingly interesting. Within the last fortnight a practice has been revived in Ireland which has been renounced for three years, the practice of calling what are known as Rival Loyalist demonstrations in Ulster for the purpose of suppressing liberty of speech."

If the King in Council authorised the appointment of a Minister, either as a Minister of the Crown or as a Member of this House it would be done with the strictest Parliamentary authority. If that were done immediately the appointment of the hon. Gentleman was made, whether he was a Minister with or without salary, he would draw up Orders in Council, and these ought to be the legitimate subject of criticism in Parliament. Therefore, he submitted that the Committee would do well to receive the proposal of the Government, because they would then have Parliamentary control over the acts of the Council in Wales.

*Colonel WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said that both by the last speaker and previously in the debate complaint had been made that the Opposition had not properly received the concessions that had been made. He very frankly acknowledged that an effort had been made by the President of the Board of Trade to meet the demand made by hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Opposition Benches; but the difficulty was that they did not know exactly what the concessions were. What they asked was that the President of the Board of Education should be responsible for the Welsh Council, but now they were to have a gentleman of whom they were not told whether he was to be a Minister or not. The Solicitor-General in his last speech had said that the gentleman who was to represent the Welsh Council in the House was to be a Minister. What he wanted to know was whether the new office was to be an office of profit under the Crown or not. The concession which had been made by the President of the Board of Trade was not on the Paper, he did not think the learned Solicitor-General had seen the Amendment before he came into the House; evidently the concession had been made without the Government having thought it out. His inclination was to move the adjournment of the House for an hour, in order to enable the Government to bring in a proper clause which they could understand.

Mr. ASHLEY said there was one important matter which had not been cleared up, and that was how the Minister was to deal with the Council in Wales. In the first place the Council was to consist of members appointed by the councils of counties and of county boroughs and of any boroughs and urban districts having a population of over 25,000. That was a popularly elected body, and how would it act? It would act by the decision of a majority. Supposing that body did not agree to the policy of the Minister, all that the Minister could do was the next time that the Estimates came before the House to advise the House to stop supplies because the Council had refused to carry out his policy. That was a ridiculous proposition.

*Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said he would like to raise another point. Supposing that a county council in Wales refused to grant the religious facilities allowed under the Act under Clauses 3 and 4, and was backed up in this by the Council for Wales, what course could the new Minister for Welsh Education pursue? It seemed to him that in such a case the Minister would be flouted by the Council and he would have no authority in this House. That was one of the many absurdities created by this most unworkable scheme. It was perfectly certain that if there was any part in the United Kingdom in which such questions should be settled from the outside, it was Wales; and he hoped the Minister for Education would give some assurance that there would be a measure of appeal from the action of the Council for Wales to the Board of Education. It was much to the credit of the President of the Board of Education that the moment the task of piloting this impossible Bill through the House fell into other hands than his, the Government were landed in the most hopeless tangle that they had yet been involved in.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.)

said he did not rise for the purpose of taking part in the discussion upon the constitutional question, of which a great deal more had been made than the occasion warranted. He rose because the hon. Baronet had asked what would be the relations under this new arrangement between the new Minister for Welsh Education and the Board of Education. He thought the Committee sometimes forgot that they had had before them for a long time Part IV. of this Bill, which had been described as crude by the hon. Baronet. No doubt it was faulty in some respects, but it enabled the Board under sub-section (5) to pay to the Council in Wales money granted by Parliament in respect of education and science and art in Wales with the exception of money granted in aid of universities and university colleges. He admitted that there was no indication in Part IV., as it had stood in the Bill all these weeks, of what Parliamentary control there would be over the Welsh Council, or of what his position, as President of the Board of Education, would be with regard to the money that was to be allocated. The subject had given him considerable personal anxiety, and it was a mistake to suppose that it had not received the careful consideration of the Government, though he thought, quite frankly, that it was unfortunate that it was left to the Amendments on the Paper to bring out the concessions which the Government proposed to make. The hon. Member opposite wished, in order to secure freedom from religious trouble in this new Council, to reserve to the President of the Board of Education certain appeals which might arise under the Bill. He said quite frankly that he would much sooner be quit of the whole job than not. By that he meant that he would much sooner be free from all responsibility with regard to Wales. He thought the speech of his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade must have satisfied those who listened to it that Wales was a country which was justified in the demand it made to have control in a larger degree than any other part of the country over its education, and that there was a most remarkable consensus of opinion in favour of a Council in Wales. But Part IV. left the Board of Education in, he thought, an improper and pangerous position. He had never been happy under it, and, accordingly, he spent plenty of time in endeavouring to secure that there should be proper Parliamentary control. It had been suggested that Parliamentary control should rest on him, but he did not think any one could run the two systems of education at the same time. The intention and desire was, he thought, to encourage the Welsh people to fix their own curriculum and to develop their educational system on their own lines, and that they should not be hide-bound or confined by the ideas prevalent in Whitehall relative to English education. Therefore, it was contemplated, undoubtedly, that the new Council should have a very considerable voice and say in the matter, but it was also understood that the new Minister would be responsible for the Code, and would be able to strike out any part of it which he felt could not be justified, and which might lead to an extravagant or other improper mode of distribution of its funds. He felt, as he had said, that it was impossible for one man to run the two horses at the same time, and that it was absolutely necessary that there should be a separation of the offices. But he trusted that there would always be, on account of the similarity of their work, between the Welsh Department and the English Board of Education, a perfect understanding and sympathy. He honestly believed that, although this was an experiment—an undefined experiment, in some respects, he agreed—it was an experiment which the Committee could very safely make, having regard to the limited nature of the duties that were to be entrusted to the Council, to the fact that a Minister was to be responsible for it, to the great concessions made by his right hon. friend, and to his perfect willingness to take away from the purview and scope of the Council those vexatious and troublesome questions which excited so much ill-feeling, but which, he hoped, as days went by, would be dissipated into thin air. He really thought, apart from the question of the position of the Minister, which might be worthy of consideration, that the time had come when the House might deal with this matter without much anxiety, and without treating it as a question of enormous constitutional importance. After all, it was a question which had been in the air for many years, and Gentlemen opposite, he believed, had contemplated it in some fashion or another. It was a thing well known and discussed in the Education Office, where they would be glad if they could lighten their work. They were not afraid of being shorn of some of their authority; they were not that kind of office. They had got enough work of their own to do, and they were willing to transfer to faithful shoulders the work in Wales. It was a question, too, which had been well discussed not only in Parliament, but in Wales, and there was not a man in the House or in the country who had not the *bona fide* belief that the Welsh people were perfectly competent to look after all branches of their education. Their sacrifices and the zeal for education among all classes proved it. He should have thought himself that the plan was open to a good deal of objection, and that a democratic country might have objected to representatives being appointed not directly by the people, but he would not enter on that. It was on the footing of a council of that kind that they could go forward. It did not seem to him the most perfect arrangement, but if it met the desires of the people and was capable of being worked by them, that was good enough for the Government. He did not think there would be any difficulty whatever in having a Minister in the House who should be able to respond to Questions, and who would make himself responsible, and be responsible for the Code and the regulations, and be able to exercise as much control over various local authorities as the President of the Board of Education could. He really thought that the Amendments which had been adumbrated by his right hon. friend would be a great improvement. Although he did not say it would be the most workmanlike piece of work the House ever did, he said it would be a good piece of work, and one likely in the future to redound to the cause of good education in Wales.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that before the right hon. Gentleman spoke there was really some doubt whether or not the functions of the Minister to be appointed would resemble those of the hon. Member for the Elland Division. They did not know whether they were to have a new Minister with great responsibility, or merely one who would be able to answer the necessary questions. They now knew, however, that they were to have a full-fledged Minister with great Parliamentary responsibilities. The second clear deduction from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was that the Minister must devote his time to Wales, they could not lump him up with any other duties. If the new Ministry for Wales, as he would almost call it, could be undertaken by anybody except a gentleman appointed for that particular purpose, the only Minister would be the right hon. Gentleman himself. They clearly could not lump up Welsh education with shipping and railways, with the Local Government Board, or the Colonial or Foreign Departments. If they were going to keep it in any department, that department must be the Board of Education. But this the right hon. Gentleman had formally repudiated; he had told them that he would not undertake it. It was quite evident that none of his colleagues could, and therefore they must have a separate Minister for Wales. But there was a third point that emerged. Was it not quite obvious that they could not possibly appoint a Minister for Welsh education without having it clearly in their minds that this was the beginning of a Ministry for Wales which would deal with other subjects? There was no case at present in these islands in which there was a separation of the duties of education from the other executive duties. The offices of Minister for Scotland and of Irish Secretary illustrated this. The duties and position of the Scottish Minister were defined in an Act. Was not that the businesslike and constitutional method of procedure? He pointed out that since the Government had not even put their Amendments on the Paper there would be a difficulty in embodying them in the Bill when the guillotine fell at half-past ten. It was a most preposterous method of doing business.

Mr. LLEWELLYN WILLIAMS (Carmarthen District) said the position in Wales was that they had absolute control over municipal education, and they also had absolute control of secondary education under the Secondary Board. That was set up by a Conservative Government. All the money spent by that Secondary Board was spent without any control at all. It was now proposed to set up a similar Board to have control of elementary education as the present Board had to-day of secondary education, and that that Board should have the expenditure of the money obtained from the Parliamentary grant for Wales. It was now said that as a concession there should be a Minister set up who should be not only responsible for the money spent on elementary education but also on secondary education. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite set themselves up as constitutionalists. If that was so, why did they not put this matter right in the Intermediate Education Act of 1889? As they had failed to do so the Government had now come to the rescue, and suggested that a Minister should be appointed who should be responsible for all the money spent on elementary as well as on secondary education. The proposals of the Government would legitimise the position of both elementary and secondary education in Wales. This was a concession which surely every constitutional purist should welcome, but instead the Government were not even thanked. Some hon. Gentlemen seemed to think that a constitutional revolution would be created if this new Council were set up. There were many reasons why it should be set up. Elementary education was now controlled by one authority and secondary education by quite another set of people. Part IV. of the Bill sought to co-ordinate the authority so that people who were responsible for the training of pupil teachers should also be responsible for the schools in which pupil teachers were trained. It might be a very small matter, but it was a very important one in the training of teachers. Anyone knew that the training of teachers was one of the most important things they had to do. There were other matters. They had heard from Ministerial Benches a good many objections to one of the clauses discussed yesterday, because it was said that children who should be taken to secondary schools were taken to higher-grade schools and *vice versa*. There was no doubt that the work of the higher-grade schools did overlap that of the intermediate and secondary schools in Wales as in England. If this Council were set up it would have the control both of the higher-grade schools and of the intermediate schools, and the overlapping would disappear. The President of the Board of Trade had indicated how the assurances which had been given could be carried out in order to meet every legitimate objection that might be raised, or any legitimate suspicion that might exist that this Council would use its powers unreasonably. Wales had been entrusted with its own university colleges, and with the control of its secondary education. The Board of Education used to send inspectors every year to examine the secondary schools in Wales, but he was told that the inspection had now become a triennial inspection, and even that had almost disappeared. They only asked on behalf of Wales that this House should give them the same powers with regard to elementary education as had already been given in regard to higher and secondary education.

*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he wished to repeat a question put by his right hon. friend to which no answer had been given. The President of the Board of Trade had told the Committee that the Government proposed to move a series of Amendments at a later stage of this clause in order to carry out the views of the Government, and he would ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would put the Amendments on the Paper to-night so that before the Report stage hon. Members would have adequate time to consider them. He would like to say that he was greatly interested in the speech of the President of the Board of Education. It was quite clear that the President of the Board of Education in future would have nothing whatever to do with Wales. The new Minister for the Welsh Education Department would have complete and entire responsibility.

MR. BIRRELL: We shall be under the same roof, and I hope we shall get on very well.

*LORD BALCARRES said it had been already pointed out that the transfer of one department to another in this way had been hitherto considered to require an Act to justify it. Apparently that was not now the view. Why, he did not know, but that precedent like others was blown to the winds. The Council of necessity would have to appoint its own inspectors; and presumably the local education authorities, some of which had already got their inspectors, would in future have a third branch of inspection. He could not help thinking that the new department to be created would complicate matters. So far as it introduced adequate Parliamentary control no doubt it was a great improvement. But he really could not understand why Wales should not be content with the President of the Board of Education. The Solicitor-General had said that Clause 37 was a humble measure of departmental reorganisation. Did that coincide with the views of Welsh representatives? If it was merely the grouping of officials in Wales, who were to be placed in a corner of the building in Whitehall and the responsibility towards Parliament was to remain, he could not understand why Welsh Members were not content that the President of the Board of Education should found his own Welsh department within the great department, and himself be the responsible Minister to this House. The President of the Board of Education, whether the right hon. Member for North Bristol or the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford, was far more qualified to represent education in this House for England at large or Wales in particular than any subordinate Minister by whom this work was to be carried on as a sort of extra. The effect of Clause 37 would not do away with the necessity for the Default Act. The difficulties which led to the Default Act in Wales were caused by what had been described as a state of war. No doubt a state of war had arisen which was very deplorable, but it was always possible owing to some local irritation that a situation of that kind might arise. They had been told that the control of Parliament would be complete, effective and substantial. Under the present Bill hon. Members would remember that the Government continued the Education Default Act with all its mistakes and faults, but when this Bill became law it would be impossible to put the Default Act into operation in Wales, because it only gave power to the Board of Education, which Board would have no control over education in Wales. The Default Act would in future apply to England and it ought therefore to apply also to Wales.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Default Act only applies to voluntary schools.

*LORD BALCARRES asked why, if that were the case, it was not proposed to repeal the Act. Having continued that Act for England, and having given a pledge that the control of Parliament over education in Wales would be as complete as the central control over education for England, that ought to be taken into consideration by the Government.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not think this matter could be conveniently dismissed before the debate closed. The Government adhered to their Amendments, and they meant to put them down on the Paper in spite of all discouragement. They could not do that until the Bill was through Committee and the Report stage was reached.

Question put

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 279; Noes, 50. (Division List No. 225).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'wr Hamlets, S. Geo.)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire

Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Faber, G. H. (Botson)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swans'a
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever,W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk Bgh's
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E.(Edinburgh,Central
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.

Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgno)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Magnus, Sir Philip
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Turnour and Mr. Hicks Beach.

MR. F. E. SMITH moved the omission from subsection (2) of the words "the council of each county and of each county borough shall appoint at least two representatives," and the insertion of the words "regulations shall be made by the Board of Education whereby the minority of each of the constituent local authorities shall appoint to the council a number of representatives bearing the proportion of one to three to the number appointed by the majority of that authority." If this Council was to possess confidence in any degree at all, not merely of one section but of all sections in Wales, it was essential that there should be some representation of minorities. That was essential in the interest of the minorities themselves, and it was not less essential in the interest of the majorities. He noticed from the report of the proceedings of the conference that the opinion was very clear that an Amendment such as the Government were now asked to adopt should be accepted. At the conference Mr. Lewis Morgan moved a resolution to the effect that the minorities should be entitled to a representation of one-third on the Council. The President of the Board of Trade had also expressed himself in that sense. He had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman would remove the objections of some of those who attended the conference by undertaking that some consideration should be paid to the desires of those who thought that minorities should be represented.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 23, to leave out all the words after 'that' to the end of the subsection, and insert the words 'regulations shall be made by the Board of Education whereby the minority of each of the constituent local authorities shall appoint to the council a number of representatives bearing the proportion of one to three to the number appointed by the majority of that authority.'"—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was sorry that in going through the Amendments earlier in the day he overlooked this most important matter. He agreed that the representation of minorities was an important question owing to the special conditions of Wales. The Government were anxious that the minorities should be represented, and, with that object in view, the form of Amendment he suggested was, " Provided that regulations shall be made by the Board of Education whereby the council shall be appointed in such a way as to provide for the representation of minorities on the council." This was the form in which he had intended originally to move the subsection, but he understood that the hon. Member attached importance to proportions. Undoubtedly the conference resolution was carried stating that the proportion of one to three should be maintained. If this was the desire it could be realised, for instance, by the cumulative vote, as well as by other methods; but he was anxious to know whether importance was attached to the suggested proportion of one to three.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS suggested that the words of the President of the Board of Trade should be accepted. They were essentially fair in the Principality, and after the suggestion which had come from the Treasury Bench he did not think the hon. Member for the Walton Division should press his Amendment in the form in which it was moved.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that if it were conceded that the representation of the minority should not be less than one in three, the arrangement would be acceptable.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was not proposed that it should be one in three. The Government were prepared to go one better.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the proportion should be as far as practicable not less than one in three. He admitted that by the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the minorities would get a fairer representation than would be the case under the Amendment of his hon. friend.

MR. F. E. SMITH said he thought the understanding was perfectly definite. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he wished to move an Amendment which he believed would cover all the points which had been raised by his hon. friend opposite.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 37, at the end, to insert the words, 'The Order shall provide for the distribution of powers and duties as between the council of Wales, the Board of Education, and the Member appointed to represent the council in Parliament. The following powers and duties shall be reserved to the Board of Education: (a) Any appeal to the Board of Education and the determination of any question under this Act, except where the contrary is specially provided in this Act; (b) The regulation and control of state-aided schools; and (c) All powers and duties of the Board of Education under the Charitable Trust Acts, 1883 to 1894, and the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, " That these words be there inserted."

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said that they were suddenly confronted with new Amendments which they had never seen before, but which covered hardly any of the points which had been raised by his hon. friend. Apparently the Welsh Council was to have the decision as to whether a school was or was not necessary —a most dangerous power for a local authority to possess, as even the Minister for Education had shown. The President of the Board of Education had stated that when a local education authority suppressed a voluntary school they need not state that it was for any religious or sectarian reason, but on account of the want of accommodation or for sanitary or other purposes. If a local education authority was going to suppress a voluntary school they need not state that it was for any religious reason, but on account of want of accommodation or sanitation, or that they wanted to get rid of a redundant school. If the local authority wanted to suppress a school, or not to pay a teacher a sufficient salary, there was to be no appeal to any superior authority. He was bound to say that they had heard a great many honeyed words from the right hon Gentleman. Living as he did on the borders of Wales, he knew how much importance was to be attached to such words used by the natives of a very courteous nation; but he preferred to judge them more by their actions than by their words. The right hon. Gentleman had instructed an audience of Nonconformists at Brighton how to evade the Act of 1902 by the interposition of all sorts of delays, and his advice had been followed in a specific case at Swansea. Whatever might be said for the Amendment, it would give no effective control over unjust and intolerant proceedings on the part of the Welsh Council. He also objected to the Amendment because it put a premium on disobeying or avoiding the law. He did not see any reason why one part to the country, simply because it refused to obey the law should be given a separate Council and a separate Minister to represent it in Parliament—as for instance Lancashire. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?] Lancashire had only to resist this Bill if it ever became law, he would point out, as Wales had done, and the present Government should give Lancashire separate treatment from the other parts of the country. That was his point. They had heard a great deal about the anxiety of the Welsh nation for the promotion of education. No doubt that was to a large extent true; but they had also a record of great injustice and intolerance, and they had not been shown to have sufficient expert knowledge and advice for the control of education without the assistance of the Board of Education. He therefore hoped that this Amendment would not be accepted but that a division would be taken upon the matter.

MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) pointed out to the hon. Member that the Welsh schools would be under popular control by reason of this Bill, and that, therefore there would be no occasion for a Defaulting Authorities Act under the new conditions. Under this Act there would be no tests for teachers, because they would be altogether abolished. When the hon. Gentleman dealt with Wales and drew an analogy between Wales and Lancashire, he would ask him to study the history of his own Party in regard to Wales. He would then find that the precedents for the separate treatment of Wales were set by his own Party which created a central Welsh Board. The hon. Member's Party also gave them the Intermediate Education Act. Why did the Conservative Party give them the Intermediate Education Act and a Central Welsh Board? The reasons were given by a Departmental Committee appointed in 1880, who said that the distinctive characteristics of Wales in regard to education supported their claim for separate treatment and for a distinct and national system of education. This claim was greatly strengthened, the Committee said, by the keen desire for education displayed by the masses of the people. The Central Welsh Board was the creation of the Constitutional Party, who also passed the Intermediate Education Act, but the Opposition did not seem to understand that Act, which was one of their own creations. They did not seem to know that a distinguished educationist, Mr. Bruce, furnished a Report upon their central system of education to the Treasury, and it was now proposed that, instead of claiming a grant of money for Wales in that way they should have in the House of Commons a Minister who would be responsible for the conduct of educational affairs in Wales. He thought they had got a very distinct case for the change now suggested showing continuity of policy. The policy was started by the Conservative Party and all that was being done now was to go one better than that Party. They were simply converting a department into a Ministry, and instead of controlling secondary and higher education only they were seeking under this Bill to unify secondary and higher education with elementary education, so that instead of having one controlling body to look after secondary education they should have a Ministry which would control both higher and elementary education, which they could criticise in this House, and which would bring the whole case of Wales before the House, thus insuring that no injustice would be done to the minority.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said they always welcomed a speech on this subject from the hon. Member for the Arfon

Division, because he invariably brought into the discussion of any question a spirit of poetry and enthusiasm too often absent from these debates. He also thought they ought to recognise the conciliatory tone which the President of the Board of Trade had shown throughout the discussion, and therefore he did not wish to introduce a jarring note when he asked the right hon. Gentleman to consider the position in which the Committee stood with regard to this clause. When the Government introduced a clause providing for education in Welsh counties under a National Council the Opposition had pointed out from the inception of the Bill that that clause was extremely crude in its construction. There was no provision for the representation of minorities in local educational authorities, no provision for a representative in this House, very large powers were conferred upon the Council and taken from Government Departments, and there was no control over the Council in regard to the demand or expenditure of money. So matters remained until to-day. So far as they knew up to half-past three this afternoon the Government adhered to what he must call a crude proposal for establishing Home Rule for Wales in educational matters without any responsibility being insured to Parliament. His hon. friend the Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool put down a series of Amendments, but they had no indication that those Amendments would be looked upon with anything but the most unfaltering hostility by the Government, for this was the spirit in which all their Amendments had been regarded. But what had happened? The President of the Board of Trade had no doubt in a most genial manner put before the Committee an entirely different conception of the clause. His explanation put an entirely different complexion upon its provisions. It appeared from his statement that instead of the Council being responsible only to itself and receiving from the Board of Education money which it was to spend at its own will and pleasure, they were to have a Welsh Minister for Education in this House and that a Department for Welsh Education was to be created. They were to have a transfer of the powers of the present Education Department for dealing with Welsh education; a transfer not provided for in the Bill. They were to have a transfer of the staff and the duties of the Board of Education from Whitehall to a new department, and that department was to be represented by a Minister. Whether he was to be an independent Minister or a representative of some other department they did not know. Whether he was to be salaried or unsalaried they did not know. Whether he was bound to vacate his office on appointment and was liable to re-election, that also they did not know. On all these matters they were left in ignorance, and they had to accept the proposal upon Amendments of which they had had no notice and which had never appeared upon the Paper. These Amendments had, in fact, been sprung upon them for the first time in the course of the afternoon. There was another subject of criticism, and that was that it appeared that this new department was to have all the powers of the Board of Education except some which were not specified. It was true that the President of the Board of Education had promised to introduce Amendments upon the Report stage in which his proposals would be embodied, but they had never seen those proposals.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I mentioned them just now.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that that was quite true, but that was in accordance with his statement that although they had heard them stated they had never seen them upon the Paper. No doubt the President of the Board of Trade put these proposals before the Committee very clearly, but they were still of a somewhat intangible character, and they were asked to accept as satisfactory a clause which had been laid before them only within the last half-hour. They had never seen it in a written form.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE passed across the Table to the hon. Baronet a paper which set forth his proposals

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON thanked the right hon. Gentleman and read the document, but still complained that the

Committee had not had sufficient notice of the Amendment. He admitted that the concessions made were important, but surely when they were dealing with the cutting into two sections of one important department the House was entitled to more than a momentary period for consideration. He did not think any one who had had anything to do with the Board of Education could doubt for a moment that a combination of a Board of Education for Wales and the Board of Education for England, reserving to the Board of Education for England an appellate jurisdiction over the Board of Education for Wales, but delegating a number of powers from the one to other, would create a most complicated machinery in the conduct of education and create friction between the two departments for England and Wales. He asked whether it was fair to the cause of education or fair to the Opposition that a matter of this magnitude should be dealt with in such a way. The regulation of secondary education in itself was a matter of growing importance, and he did not think that the Government were justified in treating it thus. The question as to the jurisdiction which was to be reserved to the Education Department in England also seemed to him to be a very important question, and in his opinion this Amendment did not cover the ground which was traversed by the Amendments of his hon. friend the Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool. But the Amendment itself created difficulties. They were told that State-aided schools were to be reserved from the jurisdiction of the Welsh Department, but the question was not merely whether that was desirable or not. Were the State-aided schools, which he understood were to be exempt from the control of the local authority, to come under the Code of the Board of Education or that of the National Council? On what ground was the Parliamentary grant to be determined? Was it to be determined as in England by the Code, and from that Code were the State-aided schools to be excepted? Was there to be a Code for Wales and, if so, were the State-aided schools to come under that Code or the English Code? He did not ask these questions because he wished to be difficult or tedious, but because he thought the Government had entered into a very difficult question suddenly on a warm summer afternoon from which the impromptu schemes of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, brilliant improvisations though they might be, could not extricate them.

Mr. F. E. SMITH said he had considered, as far as he had been able under the difficult circumstances in which he had been placed, the Amendment put down by the Government in substitution for that which he had proposed to move. Having considered it he had reluctantly come to the conclusion that it did not in fact carry out either what was promised or what those entitled to speak for the voluntary schools had a right to ask for. The question was raised at the conference to which allusion had been made, not merely on the question of revenue and on two or three other points in the purview of the Welsh Council, in order that they might be dealt with by the Board of Education; it was raised on a much broader ground, as was shown by the Amendment moved by Mr. Lewis Morgan which was drawn up in the widest possible language. That Amendment read as follows—

> "In case any appeal should be made by the trustees and managers of the non-provided schools against any decision or act of the local education authority, such appeal should be to the Board of Education and not to the Council."

If anything securing that had been expressed in the Government Amendment there would have been no reason why he should have persevered, as an alternative, with the Amendment which he had placed upon the Paper. But one became a little doubtful, not of the good faith of the right hon. Gentleman, but of the success with which he carried out his intention when he said that this Amendment was the only possible way of commending the proposals of the conference to all schools of religious thought in Wales. He submitted that his Amendment did secure everything that was asked for by the Amendment of Mr. Lewis Morgan at the conference. He with great respect pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman that unless the Amendment did categorically state that all denominational questions were to be excluded from the jurisdiction of the Council there would be no satisfaction at all so far as the voluntary schools were concerned. Until some more explicit explanation was given he maintained that the Amendment which he had put down was more likely to secure the results they desired.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought there was no difference so far as intention was concerned between the hon. Member for the Walton division and himself. The hon. Member had called attention to the amendment moved by Mr. Lewis Morgan at the conference, but he thought the clause as he had read it to the Committee embodied the proposals of that amendment. If it did not he would certainly be prepared upon Report to agree to any Amendment which would carry out that pledge. The noble Lord's proposal was that in case any appeal were allowed under the Bill of 1906 it should be to the Board of Education, and not to the National Council. He thought subsection (a) of the Amendment he had produced meant that. Therefore it seemed to him that they had carried out the pledge given at the conference. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Oxford University had raised the question of the regulation of State-aided schools. He quite admitted that that was so controversial a question that they could not expect the representatives of the voluntary schools to have perfect confidence in the National Council. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asked whether this meant that they were going to have a separate Code for the State-aided schools. He should certainly think not. He should say that the Board of Education would examine these special schools according to the same standards as were applicable to all the other schools in Wales. All that was wanted was that they should be tested fairly according to the same standards as were applicable to all other schools in the country. The hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford had admitted that the Government were making a very considerable concession in this Amendment. All the appeals under Sections 2, 3, 4, and 33 must go straight to the Board of Education. The Council would not intervene at all in these matters. Surely that was a very considerable concession. It meant that whenever denominational rights came into conflict with the county councils of Wales, this body, which represented the county councils, would not be called upon to adjudicate, but the Board of Education would adjudicate exactly as it did in England. He thought the hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool would admit that the Government had covered in this Amendment all the points that he had raised. As regarded the suggestion that there should be an appeal to the Board of Education, the Government thought that upon the whole the appeals should go to the Minister who was responsible to the House of Commons. The hon. and learned Gentleman was concerned about the points that would arise under Section 5. Under that section the question was one concerning new schools to be built, which came under the conditions of Clause 4. Supposing there was no National Council, the county councils in Wales would decide in the first instance whether they would allow them. If they did not allow them there was no appeal to the Board of Education provided by the Bill. At the present moment there was no appeal; but if eventually on the Report stage or elsewhere an appeal was inserted it would go to the Board of Education and not to the National Council, so that really these cases were covered by the words he had read out to the Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR was sure the President of the Board of Trade was doing his best to redeem the various pledges that at different times he had given, but the right hon. Gentleman made a profound mistake if he thought that he had convinced the Committee that he and his friends had got out of the extraordinary and unnecessary difficulty into which they had plunged themselves. The Committee were now in a state of hopeless confusion. The right hon. Gentleman had added to the confusion by the statement he had just made. He had now stated that the State-aided schools were not to be under the new Minister for Education in Wales, but were to be under the Education

Department in England. The unfortunate Minister for Education in England, as distinguished from Wales, would have to administer, in the first place, the English schools under the English Code. He believed there was one happy moment when the right hon. Gentleman cherished the illusion that he had got rid of Wales altogether. But he had had a rude awakening, for he had discovered that there must be an appeal on all these religious and controversial topics from the Welsh authority, not to the Welsh Education Minister, but to the English Education Minister. They were to have two education authorities not divided by any clear and rational line. That was an extraordinary and anomalous position. Moreover, the State-aided schools in Wales were to be taken out of the Welsh educational system, and were to be administered by the English Education Minister under a code which he had not authorised, and for which his Department was not responsible, and about which his Department was completely ignorant. That was not very satisfactory. That seemed to him to be a confused system and he did not think it would be a pleasant system for the Education Minister for England. The unhappy Minister for Welsh Education, who was to get no salary, but was privileged to lose his seat upon election, might be brought into conflict, not with one isolated local education authority, but with a body representing Wales in its unity, Wales as a nation. By statute he was required to control them. Had he the power of mandamus and would that power be of any use if he had it? There was no machinery provided for this purpose. Had the right hon. Gentleman in his waistcoat pocket manuscript Amendments which would instruct the Committee as to how this unfortunate Minister, responsible for education in Wales, was to come down to this House and answer for that great national assembly which it was his statutory, but unpaid, duty to control? Surely it was slowly dawning on the Government that they could not in twenty minutes knock up a new constitution, even for Wales. Those in charge of the Bill could not in this casual way, without consulting their colleagues and without putting Amendments on the Paper, interfere with an ancient constitution like the Welsh constitution without getting into a hopeless muddle. The Government had got themselves into a hopeless muddle. The Nemesis was inevitable, but it had been speedy. The President of the Board of Trade unfolded his scheme at four o'clock and each succeeding half-hour had added to the mess in which they found themselves. The Committee were now approaching the hour at which, by a most happy foresight, the Government had contrived a method to get them out of the difficulty, and nothing less would do it. The solution was only a temporary one; it was the best they could get. If they could not answer a question, if they could not meet an argument, if their scheme, even by its own supporters, was regarded as a hopeless tangle ["Oh"], the guillotine was the only solution.

Sir E. CARSON asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he intended to propose any Amendment by which the House would have an opportunity of considering the distribution of powers and duties contemplated in sub-section (4) of the clause. He suggested that some alleviation of the strain might be made if the right hon. Gentleman would put in a provision that any such distribution should lie upon the Table of the House and not become law until the House passed it. That was simply asking that these matters should not be entirely withdrawn from the cognisance of the House. That would hold out some hope as to their being able to come to a conclusion as to what were to be the functions of the three different departments which were to administer one subject matter. Hon. Members might then have some opportunity of coming to a conclusion as to whether they were really carrying out the wishes of the House or not. If the matter was left as it stood at present all he could say was that, so far as the House was concerned in the absence of such a provision, they were simply passing a farrago of nonsense.

Lord R. CECIL said that sub-section (7) provided that —

> "An Order in Council made for the purposes of this section may be varied or revoked by any subsequent Order so made."

The result was that it would be entirely in the option of the Government to make any Order they liked whether in accordance with the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman or not. He could not think that the Government really intended that. He suggested that the eighth sub-section must be amended in order to give Parliament some control over the grants.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the noble Lord's objection was met by the provision in sub-section (8) whch required that—

> "The draft of any Order in Council proposed to be made under this section shall be laid before each House of Parliament for not less than four weeks during which that House is sitting before it is submitted to His Majesty in Council."

SIR E. CARSON: Would the right hon. Gentleman say what opportunity the House would have of discussing the Order?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the House would have the same opportunity in this case as in the case of any other Order in Council which had to be laid before Parliament. In the absence of the Leader of the Opposition they were getting on admirably, because the debate was conducted by men who knew something about it. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman cared whether concessions were made or not. The Government had been making a real and serious effort to meet the criticisms and to allay the apprehensions of his own countrymen who did not happen to agree with him on certain points. They had gone very far in attempting to meet them. Then the right hon. Gentleman came in, and without having followed the course of the debate at all, without having the slightest notion of what concessions had been made, he denounced the Government, not for the clause, but for the concessions which they had made. He did not know that in making that speech he was ridiculing an Amendment put upon the Paper by one of his ablest supporters.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) said he could not commend to the taste and judgment of the House the words of the right hon. Gentleman. (Interruption.)

THE CHAIRMAN appealed to members on the Ministerial side to allow the right hon. Gentleman to be heard.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that if any stranger had listened to the debate he would not have placed the brand of ignorance of the subject upon his right hon. friend. They had had this question discussed, and members of the Government had been unable time after time, even after consultation one with another, to give the slightest enlightenment in regard to the clause which they had themselves introduced. He repudiated and he believed the country would repudiate, the discourteous expressions imputing to his right hon. friend ignorance of a subject of which he was a past master, and upon which the President of the Board of Trade had a vast amount to learn.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided: Ayes 387, Noes 105. (Division List No. 226.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale. W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford

Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hn. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Wugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A, G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope John Deans (Fife, West;
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R, S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.

Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A. H. (Ashton underLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W H (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James

Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, J. (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, L. (Carmarthen)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, H. J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn A J (City Lond.)
Balfour, Capt, C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh H.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George

Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, R. (Lanark, Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V (Hants., W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of

Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt Nn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
King, Sir H. Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin S
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert

Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Rawlinson.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of Clause 37:—

Question put, "That Clause 37, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided; Ayes 395, Noes 107. (Division List No. 227.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herb. Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell. Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Dev'np'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, A. W. (Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard K.
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Flynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. P'ncr's, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox. Harold
Craig, Herb. J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras,
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hn. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, Geroge Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Jas. (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget

Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
K'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Albert
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nichalson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M (Suffolk, Eye
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E.B. (Bradford, E
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester
Scott, A. H.(Ashtonunder Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson

Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond)
Balfour, Capt. C. G. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Dublin,S
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool,Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Viscount Valentia.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Mr. Birrell*), put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

RUTHERGLEN BURGH ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL (BY ORDER).

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.) moved to refer the Bill to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons. Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure Act gave this House the power of intervention in the case of private legislation. They had not taken advantage to any great extent of the power given under the Act. Only in two cases had an appeal been granted, and it had only been granted on good ground and for proper reason. He trusted that he would shew that there was good reason in this matter, and that the House would send this Order for reconsideration upstairs. To send four men up to Scotland to a district of which they knew nothing, to hear a case about which they were absolutely ignorant, wascertainly not a step in the direction of Home Rule. He had no fault whatever to find with the Commission which was sent to Scotland to hear the views of the promoters of this Bill. He believed in the good faith and impartiality of those Commissioners. They sat for sixteen days listening to evidence, and there was one tramway Bill which occupied their attention for five whole days. In this case the Commission had to consider the application of a small and unimportant borough containing about 340 acres—100 of which were not built upon—to annex an adjoining area of some 1,300 acres. It was stated before the Commission entirely erroneously and without the slightest foundation that the inhabitants of the portion proposed to be annexed had the right to vote in the municipality itself. That was an entirely misleading and malicious statement. He had resided in that ancient and Royal burgh for seven years in the very area which it was now proposed to annex and he had never had a vote for that municipality. What was more he had never been asked to vote. He hoped the supporters of this Bill would either substantiate that statement or withdraw it. This was not the first attempt made by this burgh to annex other areas. After seven years agitation they had at last found a Commission which was willing to allow them to annex these outside areas. In England he understood that one borough could not annex the surrounding areas without the consent of the inhabitants, but in this case it was proposed to annex 1,300 acres entirely against the wishes of the majority of the people living in the area concerned. Fully 70 per cent. of the electors in the area affected had petitioned this House against annexation. He thought that fact alone ought to be sufficient to induce this House to send the Bill upstairs to be re-heard before a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons. He appealed to the front Ministerial Bench not to allow this Order to be confirmed without a re-hearing of the case, because if they did they would be setting up a precedent of the utmost importance. If they passed this Bill, what was there to hinder Glasgow and other large cities and towns from annexing the surrounding areas against the wishes of the inhabitants? At the present time those living in the area which it was proposed to annex were paying rates only at the rate of about 7s., whilst in the area that was promoting this Bill the rates were about 15s. He knew this old burgh very well, having lived for thirty years in its immediate vicinity. What had the municipality of Rutherglen done? They had sent round a statement saying that they had not control even over their own cemetery. The county provided them with police, the Corporation of Glasgow treated their sewage, and he did not know what the Corporation of Rutherglen had to do with that ancient and Royal burgh except to manage the scavenging.

*Mr. R. BALFOUR (Lanarkshire, Partick) said his hon. friend had referred to the question of the cemetery. He had lived in a country where one of the features was that there was no cemetery, but he did not think that was a point they need dwell upon at all. This burgh proposed to absorb two square miles, and the question was whether that was not more than was reasonable or necessary from the point of view of the early prospective growth of the town. It was stated that the inhabitants of this area objected to being absorbed, and it seemed to him that a more complete opportunity should be given to them to state their case. All that was proposed to-night was that the matter should be referred to a Joint Committee in order that they should have a full opportunity of stating their case. It might be argued that it would throw discredit on the Commission to take that course, but he submitted that it was more important that opportunity should be given for proving that an injustice would not be done to the county of Lanark by the arrangement proposed. It was true that burghs were entitled to extend their boundaries, but counties had rights which ought also to be regarded. The point to be considered was whether justice was being done by this Bill. He had much pleasure in seconding the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.—(*Mr. Menzies.*)

*MR. RAINY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said that this matter came before the House in the form of a proposition for the extension of a burgh, and the Committee on Bills decided that the question ought to be dealt with by a Commission in Scotland. He asked the House whether, in expressing their opinion on this particular question, they were going to reverse the policy which had been laid down by the House, that matters of this kind were to be settled in Scotland on the spot, because a decision had been come to in this case which was not accepted by one of the parties to the dispute. Not only did those who opposed the Provisional Order impugn the procedure of the Court, but they deliberately attacked the constitution of the Commission which was sent down to inquire. The Commission, with the help of the best counsel on both sides, brought out every fact material to a decision, and since then no new fact had arisen, and yet these gentlemen were said to be incapable of dealing with the case put before them. He had been looking into the record of what had been done with regard to cases of this kind. On June 13th, 1901, the present Lord-Advocate, referring to this kind of procedure, said that unless there was some material new fact adduced, or substantial injustice had been done, or unless there was fault in the procedure, there ought to be no re-hearing on the floor of the House of Commons. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, formerly Secretary for Scotland, and Lord Tweedmouth, had also expressed themselves in a similar manner. Seeing that no new facts had been adduced, that there was no allegation of substantial injustice, and that there was no allegation of improper procedure he supported the Provisional Order.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said that he entirely agreed with the hon. Member who had moved the Resolution, and those who supported him, in not impugning the zeal or capability of the Committee which had considered this Bill under the Private Bills Procedure Act for Scotland, but what he wanted to emphasise was that their decision was against the procedure provided for in the Act. It should not be contended that, because appeals were infrequent, they should not be allowed. Reference had been made to Lord Balfour of Burleigh. When that noble Lord was Secretary for Scotland, he presumably expounded the intentions of the Government of the day in passing the Private Bills Procedure Act; and he pointed out that there might be two dangers attaching to the working of the Act, viz., that if the right of appeal was unduly restricted, or was made unduly lax, they would make the Act a nullity; that was why the clause in its present form was inserted as to an appeal to Westminster. The clause was supported by Lord Dunedin who was then Lord-Advocate; while the present Lord-Advocate had admitted that there was a right of appeal when new facts had emerged. In this particular case what they alleged was that an appeal should be granted on the grounds of essential error; that the decision was contrary to public policy, and that new facts had emerged. In regard to the first there was essential error in regard to the ancient rights of the people who resided within the boundaries of the burgh, and had rights as to voting in elections for members of the municipality. The object of the Bill it was said was really to end an anomaly, and to unite the Parliamentary and the police boundaries of the burgh. The reply to that was that there was not an anomaly, and that the proposal in the Bill would not put an end to it, if it existed. There were many burghs in Scotland in which the Parliamentary and police boundaries were not coincident—such as Arbroath, Ayr, Campbelton, Dysart, St. Andrews, etc. He had not been able to discover any rural part in Scotland in which these boundaries were coincident. The real fact of the matter was that this Royalty argument proved too much, because if the House were going to say that a burgh such as Rutherglen was entitled to hold Royalty privileges, they were going to involve themselves in a difficulty not only in the case of this municipality, but in the case of other municipalities. The area of Rutherglen formed a large portion of the ground upon which Glasgow stood, and if the House was going to insist upon the Royalty rights being maintained they would get into an *impasse*. As a matter of fact the Royalty argument had nothing to do with the matter, because the real rents of the land were ungathered. In this particular instance of Rutherglen the rents amounted to £1 13s. 9½d. per annum, and therefore the sum at stake on the part of the Exchequer was not a large one. The Parliamentary area had nothing whatever to do with the matter. The House would therefore see that the contention that by this Bill these areas were to be handed over could not be defended when the facts were looked into. The Bill would not unite the municipal and the police areas, nor would it unite the Parliamentary area. The burgh would include a number of areas which were outside the Royalty area or the Parliamentary area. He thought the contention put forward in support of the Bill was unfounded and ought never to have been put before the Commissioners or the House. He came to the second peg upon which they were hanging their case, and that was that this decision was contrary to public policy. The Court of Session in Scotland and the House of Lords had decided that there was no ground for the suggestions which were put before the House on behalf of the burgh in this case. Moreover, it was admitted that the conditions which were required in every case of extension under the Public General Statutes were not present in this case. There was not such a density in regard to population as required this change; there was no unanimous consent on the part of the inhabitants who were affected, and there was no allegation that the area had been mal-administered under the county council. Under the county administration in Scotland there were special areas in regard to drainage, and lighting the charges for which fell upon the county council who had to administer these matters. According to his experience these bodies did their work in an admirable manner, but the boundaries fixed by this Bill would play havoc with those drainage and lighting boundaries and leave odd corners undealt with. The House would hardly believe that under the Bill the boundary could be so drawn in such a way that in the case of a large number of houses a man's kitchen might be in Glasgow and his sitting room in Rutherglen. Moreover, the road through the district followed a tortuous course and in consequence at one place it would be in Glasgow and at another in Rutherglen. At other places the boundary resolved itself into a question of vulgar fractions. These boundaries were never considered by the Commissioners at all. As a matter of fact the promoters dropped a portion of their scheme, and as the inquiry only lasted seven hours the other side were unable to produce witnesses to deal with this new state of things. The matter was one for an expert surveyor to decide, and any such extension of the area should be accepted by the inhabitants. But the inhabitants had been inactive in the matter. They did not appear before the Commissioners, and if they had done so the Commissioners would not have come to the conclusion which they did. As to the reason why they did not appear, he could only say that they had heard the cry of "wolf, wolf" so often before and they had had in the past to put their hands in their pockets to keep the wolf from the door so often, that in this case they thought the proposal, being more audacious than usual, must fail as they had defeated the other proposals. It might not be a sternly logical attitude, but it was a very common and human one. He asked the House to realise that in this matter the question of consent had only emerged since the decision had been given in the inquiry. The fact which had only emerged since this inquiry that the inhabitants were dissenting parties to the agreement was one which he submitted ought to have great weight with the House. The only person who spoke in favour of these citizens' assent was an estimable gentleman who pointed out that the reason he was in favour of the Order was that he was a feuar outside the area at the time; that under his contract he had to make private roads; that he did not make private roads very well, so he went to the county council and asked them to take over the roads, and they said they were not in favour of giving something for nothing and would not do it. He then went to the borough councils and they consented to take over the roads. This gentleman and a few like him were the only consenting persons, and the fact that there had been these petitions from people dissenting ought to be taken strict notice of in this House. He had tried to put before the House what, so far as his information went, were the real facts of the case, and he made an earnest appeal to Members to consider whether this was not one of those exceptional cases provided for by the Act of 1899.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) hoped the House would not listen to the proposal which had been made to send this Bill to another tribunal. So far as the county council was concerned, nobody pretended that their case had not been put fully before the Commissioners and very ably argued. The Commissioners having had all the facts before them and having come to a unanimous decision upon the subject, this House, he submitted, ought not in the absence of any new facts—and he contended that no new facts had been adduced—send this Bill before another tribunal. He submitted that there had been no injustice done in this matter.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said that during this discussion no reference had been made to what ought to guide those who were not Scotsmen in this matter, and who were not conversant with the Private Bill Procedure of Scotland. The House had had the inestimable advantage of guidance upon this question from the Deputy-Speaker, who had written a letter which had been sent to hon. Members. That document contained the chief and subsidiary reasons why the House should pass this Motion. They had been told that this was not a case in which the power of appeal should be exercised. The document to which he referred clearly stated that this was one of those matters which ought to be referred to the Joint Committee to be reheard. If they rejected this Motion they would be encouraging small local areas to dictate to larger areas. [Cries of "Agreed."] Hon. Members opposite cried "agreed," but when it happened to be a matter in which Manchester was affected they had to listen to the discussion *ad nauseam*, and when it was a matter in which the rights of Scotsmen were concerned, hon. Members opposite wanted to go to bed. He approached this subject with no local bias, but purely because it affected the primary right of a large population which sought to keep within its own area certain valuable rateable property which a greedy burgh for its own selfish purposes wished to absorb. For those reasons he hoped the Bill would be referred to the Joint Committee. The mover of this Resolution had told them how he had been deprived of a vote for this burgh, and indicated that the reason was inefficient administration. If they wished that the real desires of the population in these areas should be ascertained they ought not simply to rely upon the Scottish private Bill procedure, but the inhabitants should be given a full right of appeal to Parliament.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said he was very reluctant at this late hour to detain hon. Members. The House would no doubt recollect the genesis of the private Bill procedure for Scotland. The increasing volume of Scottish private business made it more and more difficult to find the necessary time for the proper examination of that business in Parliament, and there was also the conviction that in matters purely local it might be possible for the localities to come to a decision themselves. It was thought highly desirable that they should find some simpler and more economical method of procedure than bringing down witnesses to Westminster and going through all the elaborate machinery of a Parliamentary inquiry. Consequently the Act of 1899 was passed, and this year the necessity and advantage of such procedure must surely be as strongly felt as it was at the time of the passing of the Act. He thought their experience this year had shown that the system worked smoothly and successfully; there was no doubt that it had been a success. He thought it would be agreed that the keystone of the system was the local inquiry. Parliament had reserved the right of deciding whether there should be a rehearing of the case or not after the case had been heard before a local Commission, and it was that rehearing which was now asked for by this Motion. One hon. Member had somewhat ignored the opportunity for this rehearing. He wished to point out that it was an integral part of the statute, and of the proceedings under the statute. At the same time the discretion of Parliament in the matter was a full discretion, and each case had to be decided upon its merits. There had only been three cases since the institution of this procedure in which a rehearing had been asked for. In one case the hon. Member who moved the Motion afterwards withdrew it; in the second case the decision of the local inquiry after rehearing was confirmed, and the third case came before the Joint Committee and the local decision was again confirmed. Not only the intention of the Act and the good working of the system, but also the precedents bore out and supported the argument that a rehearing should only be given under special circumstances. The question was, Had a case been made out for special circumstances? The Provisional Order promoted by the burgh of Rutherglen was examined by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and it was then decided that this Provisional Order should be examined in Scotland by a Commission. It was passed by the County Council of Lanarkshire, who now requested that there should be a rehearing. He thought the case had been clearly and moderately stated by both sides, and no complaint could be made that this Motion was not a perfectly proper exercise of the right under the statute. He thought the discussion which had taken place must already have convinced hon. Members that this House was not a proper tribunal for the decision of such a question as this. The merits of the case had been gone into at some length. If it was right and proper that the case should be reheard, the proper place for the rehearing was upstairs. He had made it his duty to do his best to arrive at an opinion upon the subject. Statements had been made throwing doubt upon the adequacy and thoroughness of the local inquiry which had been held, and various other objections had been urged. He thought the matter, which was a single and simple issue, had had a thorough and fair hearing before the Commission. That tribunal not only gave the case a fair hearing, but it arrived at a unanimous decision, and therefore he saw no reason for urging the House to support the hon. Member for South Lanarkshire in the Motion he had made. It was a matter which the Government left to the decision of the House. He had stated as clearly as he could the opinion at which he had arrived after giving the whole matter very careful consideration.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said that, as the representative of a neighbouring constituency, he wished to say a word or two. The Secretary for Scotland had said the matter was to be left to the House to decide, but he had not expressed any very definite opinion upon the question.

MR. SINCLAIR: I spoke as the Minister in charge of this Bill, and I spoke for the Government in regard to it. The Government decided that whilst they do not think the case ought to be reheard, they would leave the matter to the House.

MR. COCHRANE said that meant that the Government expressed an opinion, but had not the courage to support it. They were getting used to that kind of thing from the Government.

MR. SINCLAIR pointed out that in adopting this course they were following precisely the same course as that which was adopted by the late Government.

MR. COCHRANE said he did not wish to bandy words with the right hon. Gentleman. He happened to be one of those who gave the Scottish private Bill procedure his support. He thought many advantages were to be gained by that system, and therefore he was not in any way hostile, and he would not do anything that would in any way weaken the system. When the House legislated in this direction they contemplated a form of appeal to a joint committee in cases where new facts could be adduced. He had listened to the debate with a perfectly open mind, and he ventured to say that a strong *prima facie* case had been made out for further inquiry. Hon. Members who had spoken were not the only ones who had expressed an opinion. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark had been most effectively muzzled in this Parliament, but he had written a letter of a most convincing character in which he said—

> "On the whole I think a clear case for rehearing exists, and although not taking any part in the discussion in the House I wish you every success."

In the debate on the Arizona Copper Company Provisional Order the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said that what the House did in 1899 was to maintain the practical supremacy of Parliament, and provision was made that in cases where it could be shown that injustice had been done Parliament should have the power of making fresh inquiry. That was all that was desired here. The objectors said that they had not been adequately represented before the Commission, and he thought there was a great deal in their contention. His hon. friend had pointed out that it was proposed to set up impossible boundaries. Surely that was a matter which required reconsideration. A material fact which was not brought before the Commission was that certain persons who were said to have municipal votes were not found on the register when the matter was inquired into. The ratepayers in the area proposed to be absorbed never dreamed that this Provisional Order would be granted. The district was well administered, and they desired an opportunity of expressing their views on the proposal.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 202. (Division List No. 228.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H.M.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cochrane, Hon, Thos H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Fullerton, Hugh
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Montagu E. S.
Murray, James
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Menzies and Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Brace, William
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hn. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, W.
Clough, W.
Cogan. Denis J.
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis, William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dolan, Chas. Joseph

Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts. Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr Rainy and Mr. Crombie.

Bill to be considered to-morrow.

CROWN LANDS [RECOVERY OF CROWN RENTS].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient that no proceedings shall be taken by or on behalf of the Crown for enforcing the payment of any quit rent or any other perpetual rent payable to the Crown in Ireland, or any arrears thereof, but within sixty years from the time when such rent was last received by or on behalf of the Crown, and that after such period the right of the Crown to the rent and arrears shall be extinguished in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Crown Lands Acts, 1829 to 1894."

Resolution agreed to.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he thought that this Bill ought to take the same rank as a local or private Bill. All other local and Private Bills were sent to a Committee of both Houses for examination and consideration, and any private individuals who thought they had a grievance in connection with the proposals in the Bill were entitled to attend the Committee, with the assistance of counsel and witnesses. Why should an exception be made to that rule in the case of the Post Office Sites Bill? He wished to called special attention to Clause 11 in the Bill, by which it appeared to him that an attempt was being made on the part of a Government Department to take an unusual and unfair advantage. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster-General had stated that this clause had been put in to carry out a bargain between the Post Office and certain individuals; but the Attorney-General had said that this particular clause was an attempt on the part of the Post Office authorities to make an exception to the general law of the land, and to obtain an advantage over certain landowners. He insisted that no Government had a right to take an advantage over a private individual unless the Bill by which it was proposed to do so was sent to the Committee upstairs for consideration. They had been told in reference to the question of preference that all these Post Office Bills had been dealt with in like manner to the present one. He had taken the trouble to look up all the Bills for the past sixteen years, and had found that, with the exception of a small clause in a Bill in 1904, there was nothing of the sort. It was on that account therefore that he took the strongest exception to this Bill as an attempt to evade the ordinary law of the land, and therefore he moved that it be read this day three months hence.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford*).

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. CLAUDE HAY said he wished to second the Motion of the hon. Member for the West Derby Division of Liverpool, who had put his case so admirably. He hoped that the House would not pass any measure of a departmental character of which the Minister in charge was absolutely ignorant. ["Oh, oh," and "Withdraw."] This Bill infringed on the rights of private citizens. For instance, it would empower the Post Office authorities to take the best parts of small freehold premises held by a shopkeeper and leave the lean bits to the shopkeeper. ["Divide."]

THE POSTMASTER - GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the hon. Member had not followed the procedure on this Bill. The Bill was sent to a Committee upstairs and every person interested had had an opportunity of appearing before it and giving his views. There had been no opposition to the Bill hitherto, but as it would go to the House of Lords anyone interested would have an opportunity of appearing before the Committee of the Lords and stating his case. In regard to Clause 11 an exactly similar clause was in a Bill passed last year by the late Government.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 197; Noes, 16. (Division List No. 229.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Brace, William
Brodie, H. C.

Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex E. Grinst'd
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Gulland, John W.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'd
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N

Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)

Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Forster, Henry William

Hamilton, Marquess of
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.
Hills, J. W.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)

Turnour, Viscount
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Claude Hay and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. CLAUDE HAY said that upon this clause he desired to ask a question of the Financial Secretary to the Treasury. When this Bill was before the House last year it was sought to impose certain duties, which were now in the Bill in a modified form, notably a tobacco duty, and the hon. Gentleman was a strenuous opponent to their being imposed. That was a very good reason why the clause now before the House should not be adopted, and he submitted to the House that now the hon. Gentleman held a responsible position in the Government they had a right to have an adequate explanation from him as to why he had changed his mind and now asked the Committee to adopt a proposal which he so strenuously opposed in the past.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) said the hon. Member must be mistaken, because last year he did not speak upon this Bill at all. In 1904 he moved the adjournment of the debate during the discussion of the Second Reading, but that was an exceptional occasion. On that occasion he moved the adjournment on the ground that the duty on stripped tobacco was not applied also to the Isle of Man, and his Motion was lost. That was the only occasion, so far as he could remember, upon which he resisted this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment. To be read the third time to-morrow.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [Lords].

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. RIDSDALE (Brighton) moved to leave the word "corruptly" out of line 5 of the first clause. He wished to know who was to determine what was corrupt and what was not corrupt. Would it be left to His Majesty's judges? They had recently had an example of the result of leaving it to the Judges to determine what was corrupt and what was not corrupt.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD, on a point of order, asked if the hon. Member was in order in casting such a reflection upon the whole of His Majesty's Judges?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member has said anything which is out of order.

Mr. RIDSDALE said he did not desire to make any reflection whatever upon the Judges, and he only mentioned them as an illustration. It was a very difficult thing to determine what was corrupt, and consequently they ought to make it as clear as they possibly could. To say that a person did a corrupt thing corruptly was simply so much tautology, and the effect of retaining this word in the clause would be to weaken the Bill. He was anxious that the Bill should hit all those things which were now corrupting commercial life. Methods of procedure were growing up which were highly detrimental to the good conduct of honest business. This kind of thing was going on in ever-increasing ratio every year, and the Bill was a well-intentioned effort to stop it. Before the Act could be put into operation information had to be sworn, and the accused had the protection of the Vexatious Indictments Act. Besides this, the consent of the law officers of the Crown had to be obtained before the Act could be put into operation. Those who had had any experience in these matters knew how difficult it was to get the law officers of the Crown to move in the matter, and they had not forgotten the case of Mr. Whittaker Wright. There was, therefore, ample protection, and he hoped the House would consent to leave out this word "corruptly."

MR. BARRAN (Leeds, N.) said that the present Bill was weaker than the one introduced a few years ago dealing with the same subject. If it went through in its present form he thought it would be ineffective to stop some of the greatest evils which now existed in the commercial world. One of the greatest difficulties was the disloyalty and dishonesty of agents acting for principals. This affected not only the commercial but also the professional world, and it seemed to him that the Bill did not make it clear that those were criminal offences. He would give the House one illustration A great many secret commissions were considered to be the custom of the trade, and it would be very difficult to prove that these so-called customs of the trade were corrupt. They were only dealing with those who were agents of principals, and consequently promiscuous tipping would not come in. Supposing they had a man acting as agent for a principal, and all the trade was within a comparatively narrow ring. Probably the whole of those from whom he bought were willing to give him a commission. That was a recognised custom of the trade, and it was not a question of one man giving the agent better terms than another. Why were they all ready to give the same terms? Because any new man coming into that trade found it impossible in such a narrow ring to get any trade unless he gave the same commission as the others. In a case like that it would be practically impossible to get a prosecution under the Act. That was a case which was constantly occurring in both the business and the professional world. It was a system which had grown considerably within the last twenty years, and it cut off an enormous amount of trade and handed it over to those firms who were willing to trade in a dishonest fashion. He wanted the Bill to be made stronger, because the great benefit of a Bill of this kind would be not in the prosecutions, but in the stamping out of certain dishonest practices which were now considered the custom of the trade, but which ought to be made illegal and criminal. He hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out the word 'corruptly.'"—(*Mr. Ridsdale.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'corruptly' stand part of the Bill."

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said that this Bill had received several years of very careful consideration. It was originally framed by Lord Russell of Killowen. His hon. friend the Member for North Leeds was quite right in saying that in its original form the words characterising the offence were far more drastic, but Lord Russell of Killowen concluded that it would be quite impossible in such a drastic form for it to command the sympathy of the tribunals called upon to administer it and also to command the sympathy of all classes of the community. The Bill underwent in consequence a large modification, and as it was now drawn it had, year after year, received a large measure of support and approval in both Houses of Parliament. It had passed through the House of Lords four times. It had passed through the Committee upstairs in the last Parliament and this session, and both his hon. friends who had spoken had had opportunities of using the arguments they had used to-night before the Committee upstairs, and that Committee, nevertheless, by a very large majority, decided to adhere to the measure in its present form. His hon. friend now proposed to leave out the word "corruptly." He considered that that word was absolutely essential. This was a criminal measure. It proposed to attach severe penalties to conduct which fell within its provisions, and therefore it was obvious that where they were turning a citizen into a criminal, and giving a criminal character to his conduct, they should be very careful in the definition of the crime. There should be the element of criminality, or what the law called *mens rea* should be present in the person upon whom they imposed the punishment which attached to a criminal offence. His hon. friend had supposed a case in which a sum of money was taken innocently and honestly, and had suggested that the person who took it would be a criminal if he had no title to take it, and would be liable to have a prosecution brought against him. In some of the instances to which the hon. Gentleman referred, a banker, a solicitor, or a stockbroker who accepted a commission he was not entitled to take was liable to a civil action, and his civil responsibility was not touched by this Bill. The Bill proposed to go a step further, and constitute a new crime and render agents liable to criminal penalties for the receipt of commissions in certain cases. The Bill described the crime as receiving money with corrupt intention; otherwise, receiving it knowing that there was no right to receive it, receiving it with that guilty knowledge which was *mens rea*, the essential element of criminal conduct. He would give the House an illustration of the sort of offence which was meant. Take the case of a vendor of property who employed an agent with the view of obtaining the best price possible for it. The purchaser, with the object of getting the property at the lowest price possible, gave a secret commission to the vendor's agent. No one could doubt that such a transaction was corrupt in its character. It was corrupt in its intention. The commission paid by the purchaser was the price of the disloyalty of the agent employed by the vendor. It was criminal in the moral sense. The object of the Bill was to make it criminal in the legal sense. He would give another illustration. Suppose a builder contracted to erect a house, and the owner of the house, in order to ensure that the builder should put in nothing but the materials stipulated for in the contract, engaged a clerk of works, whose duty was to check the materials going into the building. The builder corrupted the clerk of works by paying him a commission to allow materials to be used in the structure which were not in accordance with the contract. That was a corrupt action on the part of the builder who paid the commission, and who sought to buy up the clerk of works for his own fraudulent ends. That would be a crime within the meaning of this section. He could give many other illustrations. His hon. friend had supposed the case of a person who honestly took a commission because it was a trade custom, who regarded it as part of his legitimate remuneration, and who accepted it without any dishonest intention. Did anyone say that that man was to be made a criminal? They could not step in and send men to prison who were not dishonest. It seemed to him that there were certain steps that must be taken in order to show that conduct was criminal, and that they might punish that conduct with penal consequences. The first step was to show that the conduct was criminal, and that the money was not taken innocently by the agent under the impression that it was part of his remuneration. Of course where they got secrecy they got the very best evidence of corruption. If the payment was taken without the knowledge of the principal, and if the agent took it knowing that the principal was not aware of it, what greater evidence could there be of corruption? Therefore as, as one of our jurists had said, the first indication of fraud was secrecy, so he would say that the very best evidence of corruption was the secrecy which characterised the transaction. There were many cases in which these payments were taken under the impression that they were part of the remuneration of the agent, and if that was so, he did not think that his hon. friend would suggest that such a man should be sent to prison, notwithstanding that the magistrate might be satisfied that he had acted throughout in a perfectly honourable way. If the word "corruptly" were omitted it would, he thought, be an undesirable thing. If the act was done secretly it was obvious that it would be corrupt, and without the inclusion of the word "corruptly" in the Bill no one would dare to give a gamekeeper a sovereign after a day's pheasant shooting or give a tip to a waiter. All these things might be said to be corrupt, unless the whole transaction was understood. Unless the word "corruptly" was included he did not see how one could make the most innocent Christmas present to a servant without being brought under the Act. In a case of perjury it must be "wilful and corrupt," and the same set of consideration applied to members of municipal corporations who took money in the course of the discharge of their public duties. This was a point with which they were familiar in our criminal jurisprudence, and it was well settled.

*MR. HILLS (Durham) said that with a great deal that had fallen from the mover and supporter of the Amendment he agreed, but he thought they would defeat their own object by asking the House to leave out the word "corruptly." He thought they were unduly frightened by the word. Before one could make a man criminally responsible, his actions must be corrupt. There was a large class of cases, perfectly ordinary business cases, in which an agent was paid by somebody who was not his principal, and if the word "corruptly" were struck out in such a case the agent would be liable to prosecution, although the nature of the transaction was generally known. Let them take the case of a man who had a piece of land to sell. He went to his solicitor, who was his agent, and said he wanted to sell it for £1,000. The solicitor found a purchaser and said his client wished to sell the land for the sum named, that it was cheap at the price, and the buyer must pay his costs. In doing that he was driving a good bargain for his principal, and yet if the word "corruptly" were omitted he would become liable under this Bill. It was a common case also that the commission payable to the agent was not paid by the principal, but by somebody else. Everything being fair and above-board, it was a perfectly legitimate way of doing business, but if the word "corruptly" was taken out of the Bill it would become criminal. Railway companies in buying land in many cases paid the costs of the vendor's solicitors, and unless the word were left in the solicitors in that case also would be liable to a criminal prosecution. Stockbrokers, moreover, also shared their commission with other people. He agreed as to the numerous evils which arose from secret commissions, which were apparent to everybody who was engaged in business, and he would do all he could to strengthen the Bill in that direction, but he did not think it would be strengthened, but weakened by the omission of this word.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that this was not a new Bill, as it had been before the House for many years, and had for one of its strongest opponents a Gentleman who was now sitting upon the Government Bench. He thought that the person that it was desired under the Bill to punish was the man who deceived his principal and got him to pay a higher price for an article because he received a commission. The House was, he thought, in favour of the Bill, and the Amendment was one which struck at the principle of it. He wished to point out, however, how careful they ought to be, especially after the speech of the Attorney-General, not to do anything which would give rise to injustice in regard to ordinary commercial transactions with which everybody was conversant. He would ask the Government whether, in view of the importance of the Bill, which created a crime, and the fact that it had only been discussed for an hour, while four or five other Amendments had to be moved, it would not be well to adjourn its consideration. He did not think there was any great advantage gained by discussing so important a Bill at that hour in the morning. He thought the Government would be able to obtain the Bill quite easily, as there was no opposition to it. His only desire was that it should be properly discussed in the interest of all parties concerned. He therefore moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said the Government were only going to ask the House to take the business down to the sixth Order on the

Paper. He had had some consultation with hon. Gentlemen opposite, and they had agreed to go as far as that. He might point out that there was a considerable amount of work to do before they dispersed for the holidays, and the Government were attempting to arrange it as fairly as they could. If they did not get the share of work done which was allotted to that evening it would only mean that they would have to sit late on another evening. The Bill had been very fully discussed, and there was no reason for the adjournment.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD hoped the House would not assent to this Motion. The Bill had been supported by most illustrious and able men, and he thought they ought to be able to dispose of it.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Question again proposed, "That the word 'corruptly' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) moved in page 1 at the end of line 27 to insert —

"And if it is proved that the said principal in either of the above ways had suffered substantial damage."

His object was, he said, to make it clear that there should be no prosecution where no harm had been done. [Cries of "Divide."] If hon. Members wanted to get home quickly he was afraid they were going the wrong way to arrive at their desire. The question was whether there was any case to be made out for this Bill as it stood.

*MR. SPEAKER said that was not the Question before the House. The hon. Member must limit himself to his Amendment. He was not entitled to discuss the whole clause.

Mr. George Whiteley.

*MR. LUPTON said the object of his Amendment was to make it clear that a person was not to be proceeded against unless he injured his neighbour. If a clerk of works corruptly received a tip and then passed bad timber or other material to the injury of his employer, that offence could be punished. But if no damage was done to anybody why trouble about it? There were two classes of Members of Parliament who supported this Bill as it stood — those who were strongly in favour of it and believed it would stop corruption; and those who tolerated the Bill because it would have no effect. He complained that the Bill as it now stood left it open to people to take vindictive action against persons who had done no harm whatever. The case of Whittaker Wright had been referred to, but Whittaker Wright got punished, and there was always the law of conspiracy. Where one person corruptly bribed another to the injury of a third party the person who bribed and the one who received the bribe could be proceeded against under the law of conspiracy, and therefore this Bill was unnecessary. The House ought to make sure that substantial damage had been done before a man was punishable. How was a man to prove his innocence against a charge under this Bill? A man was charged with corrupt intention. That could only be really proved if damage had been done to the man's employer. If the man proved that the goods were sound and were purchased at market prices he proved his innocence, but under this proposed law he would be held guilty. A corrupt intention in a man's mind should be proved by reference to his acts.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 27, at the end, to insert the words 'and if it is proved that the said principal in either of the above ways has suffered substantial damages.'"—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

LORD TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) hoped the House would not accept the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Sleaford. It was entirely unnecessary, and would make the Bill weaker than it was at the present moment. The object of the House ought to be to make the Bill as strong as possible, and not to weaken it in any way. He thought the hon. Gentleman ought to facilitate the progress of this Bill as much as possible, and he could only do that by withdrawing his Amendment.

Question put, and negatived.

*MR. LUPTON said the Amendment he now proposed to move was to substitute the word "offence" for the word "misdemeanour," in order that by another Amendment which he proposed to move they could do away with imprisonment for the first offence and substitute a fine. With permission of Mr. Speaker and the House he would speak to both those Amendments together, and thus save a repetition of his arguments. His object, as he said, was to substitute for the penalty of imprisonment the penalty of a fine, and he would suggest that the amount of the fine should be just double the amount of the damage proved to have been done. If a man was subjected to a penalty of that kind and had to bear the costs of the law suit, it would be a very severe penalty. He thought if they desired to put a stop to corruption they must not have a penalty that was not in accordance with public opinion. Many people who supported this Bill said corruption existed everywhere. He did not believe it, but if it did then corruption was in accordance with public opinion. His point was that if the penalty was contrary to public opinion, public opinion would not enforce the law and it would become a dead letter. This was a law to help capitalists to manage their business with the aid of the police instead of looking after it themselves. ["Divide, divide."]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member is now discussing the Bill as a whole. He must confine himself to the Amendment.

*MR. LUPTON said his Amendment was to substitute a fine for imprisonment. By these severe punishments they were going back several hundred years. Heavy punishments increased crime because they increased the sense of brutality in the nation.

MR. PATRICK WHITE seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 28, to leave out the words 'a misdemeanour' and insert the words 'an offence.'"—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

*LORD TURNOUR said the Amendment he had to propose was "On page 2, line 11, after 'Crown' to insert 'or under any Corporation, or any Municipal Borough or District Council, or any Board of Guardians.'" The clause applied the Bill to servants of the Crown, and his Amendment proposed to extend it to the servants of various local bodies. The Amendment was in accordance with the principle and intention of the Bill. If there was a necessity for servants of the Crown coming under the Bill there was a double necessity for servants of local authorities being included. Whereas corruption and chances of corruption were very rare amongst servants of the Crown, amongst the servants of local authorities they were not so rare as they ought to be. He would not refer to any instances which had occurred lately, because he had an old-fashioned prejudice, not shared in by the hon. Member for Woolwich, against referring to cases *sub judice*. He thought by accepting his Amendment the Government would be taking a step in the direction of restoring confidence in local administration.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, after the word 'Crown' to insert the words 'or under any Corporation, or any Municipal Borough or District Council, or any Board of Guardians.'"—(*Lord Turnour.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir JOHN WALTON said he was not sure that the words were required, because the clause was inserted to meet the case of servants of the Crown subject to special circumstances. To remove any doubt in the matter he would accept the words.

Question put, and agreed to.

Words inserted accordingly.

*Lord TURNOUR moved the omission of sub-section (1) of Clause 2. He thought the Bill was very much weakened by this sub-section. He was not a lawyer, and there might be some good reasons for including the sub-section, but as it stood it seemed to him that it was unnecessary. He begged to move.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) formally seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, to leave out sub-section 1) of Clause 2."—(*Lord Turnour.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir JOHN WALTON said this proposal was opposed by clerks, land agents, surveyors and others who were apprehensive that under cover of this legislation blackmailing would be rife, and a discharged servant or agent would threaten criminal proceedings. They were afraid that mere publicity would entail very disastrous results. Therefore it was suggested that before any proceedings were taken it should be submitted to the law officers of the Crown, with the result that all opposition was withdrawn. Under these conditions he was unable to accept the Amendment.

*Mr. HILLS said that if this sub-section was left in the Bill it would lose half its value.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

STATUTE LAW REVISION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. CLAUDE HAY said that at the Committee stage the Lord Advocate promised to make certain inquiries, and make a statement on the Third Reading in regard to certain points which were raised.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL for SCOTLAND (Mr. Ure, Linlithgowshire) said all those points had been carefully considered and they were found to be most effectively dealt with.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 18*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]. Verbal Amendments made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered ; to be read the third time.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered ; Amendments made ; Bill to be read the third time.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered ; to be read the third time.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [Lords] (by Order). Adjourned debate on Second Reading [9th July], further adjourned till Monday next.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Considered ; and ordered to be read the third time To-morrow.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill. Read a second time ; and ordered to be considered To-morrow.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords] (by Order). Consideration deferred till Tuesday next, at a quarter-past Eight of the clock.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against : from Blythe ; Dean Prior ; Thrumpton ; and Towyn ; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law ; from Gartree ; Mackworth and Markeaton ; and Over, (two) ; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Littleover, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of return of Alien Passengers brought to the United Kingdom from Ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ending 30th June, 1906 ; together with the number of Expulsion Orders made during that period requiring Aliens to leave the United Kingdom [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1905–6, with Appendices [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table,

REVENUE (COLLECTION OF TAXES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 10th July ; *Mr. McCrae*] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 269.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3764 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (The Palace Court), Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents belonging to the abolished Court of the King's Palace at Westminster which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act].

NAVAL EXPENDITURE (PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS).

Return ordered, "of the Naval Expenditure of each of the principal Naval Powers, showing their total estimated Naval Expenditure in each of the last ten years, their Expenditure in each of the years named on new Construction, and the amount of their new Construction in each of those years expressed in tonnage."—(*Mr. Thomasson.*)

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "showing the sum levied in each parish in Scotland by way of Assessment for the building and repair of churches and manses, and also for any expenditure on glebes and churchyards, during the 10 years ending the 15th day of May, 1905; also Return to distinguish the parishes in which the Assessment is levied according to the valued rent and those in which it is levied according to the real rent, and to show the total number of heritors assessed for the above purposes in each parish during the said period, distinguishing those at and under £50 of annual value and those above £50 of annual value; and also Return giving the names of those parishes in which no assessment has been levied during the above period."—(*Mr. McCrae.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Customs Regulations at the Port of Liverpool.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the port of Liverpool is amenable to the transhipment regulations specified by the Board of Customs in their general Order, No. 45, of 1898; and, if so, will he say who is responsible, and what are the reasons for allowing relaxations of the regulations which enable the merchants of Liverpool to remove dutiable goods, excepting tobacco and casks of spirits, in open conveyances, without an officer in charge, thereby giving traders privileges which are not enjoyed by the merchants of London, and other approved transhipment ports in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The transhipment regulations prescribed by the Board of Customs are applied generally at Liverpool as at all other approved transhipment ports in the United Kingdom. The great bulk of the goods transhipped at Liverpool are free of duty, the remainder being chiefly low-duty goods and spirits in cases, the contents of which could not easily be tampered with without detection. About ten years ago the Board, after full consideration of all the local conditions at Liverpool, and particularly those relating to the situation, security, and contiguity of the docks, allowed certain relaxations of the regulations under which their local collector was authorised to dispense with the attendance of an officer in charge of the conveyances containing transhipment goods. Under this arrangement the interests of the Revenue have been in no way prejudiced, while business has been facilitated and merchants and shippers relieved of unnecessary expense. Similar relaxations are allowed at other ports where the local conditions afford reasonable security for the protection of the Revenue.

Special Allowances to Customs Officers.

MR. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the special allowances of £15 and £7 10s. per annum granted to a section of Customs examining officers, second class, as compensation for retardation of promotion due to departmental reorganisations and other causes, is partially withdrawn when the ordinary salary amounts to £207 10s. and £215 respectively, and is entirely taken away when £220 is reached; that those officers are thus obliged to remain at £220 for three and two years respectively; and whether, having regard to the fact that the promises of more rapid promotion held out in the Goschen Minute of 1891 have not been realised, the Treasury will authorise payment of the special allowances referred to without interruption until the maximum salary of £250 is reached.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The conditions as to the grant of the allowances referred to are not fully set out in the Question. Under Treasury authority special temporary allowances, not exceeding one or two years' increments, viz., £7 10s. or £15, were granted to certain second class examining officers until their salaries and allowances together should reach £220, the ordinary maximum of their class. At that point they were to "mark time" until a year after their salaries would, in the normal course, have reached £220. The extension to £250 is intended to meet the cases of those officers of good conduct who have failed to obtain promotion to the higher class before reaching their ordinary maximum salary. Since the date when the Goschen Minute of 1891 took effect, the proportion of superior appointments has been increased, and these temporary allowances have been granted. The Board of Customs are of opinion, in which I concur, that the claims of the class have been reasonably met, and that the scale of pay is adequate to the duties performed.

Promotion of Customs Examining Officers.

MR. MASTERMAN: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that it takes a Customs examining officer, second class, nineteen years, under the most favourable circumstances, to proceed from the initial to the maximum salary of his class; can he say whether such a period obtains in any other grade in the Customs or other public Department where the duties performed are of equal importance and responsibility; and whether, seeing that many of those officers had already served from twelve to sixteen years before obtaining the position, and only a small proportion can ever hope for further advancement under existing conditions, the Treasury will take steps, either by increasing the annual increment or giving an immediate advance after having served a certain number of years in the class, so that the maximum salary can be reached in a shorter time.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I understand that it takes eighteen years for a Customs examining officer, second class, to reach in ordinary course his maximum salary (£250), and that the average previous service of the existing members of the class is eleven years two months. I have already stated the reasons why I do not think the conditions of these officers' service calls for improvement, but I would like to point out that the existing number of the class to-day is 834, and that there are no less than 380 superior posts in the direct line of promotion (*vide* my Answer to the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness on May 4th last). †

Coal Consumption in the Navy.

MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state what is the latest data as to coal consumption per twenty-four hours continuous running at cruising and full speeds of quadruple and turbine engines on His Majesty's ships of similar displacement and speed; and the relative cost of construction of these types of engines.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Admiralty are averse from making any detailed statement at present in regard to the experience hitherto gained as to the working of turbine machinery. Nothing has occurred recently to alter their favourable opinion of this type of machinery.

Wages in Royal Dockyards.

SIR J. BAKER (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, on his moving Vote 8 of the Navy Estimates, he will be prepared to make a general statement on the subject of the wages of men employed in the Royal Dockyards, and in particular to deal with the points of the petitions presented by the men to their Lordships.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) I hope to be able to make a statement on this subject of a very general character when Navy Vote 8 is taken.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvi., 844.

Chief Superintendent of Telegraphs at Glasgow—Age Retirement.

MR. WATT (Glasgow College): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the Chief Superintendent of Telegraphs at Glasgow, notwithstanding his having exceeded the age limit by nearly three years, continues in the service on full pay, while officers in the lower grades at the same office are compulsorily retired at sixty years of age on pension allowances; and whether he will consider the advisability of enforcing retirement at sixty years of age among all grades of the service.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The rule is that all pensionable officers, of whatever grade, who are not thoroughly efficient, are called upon to retire at sixty; but retirement at sixty is not enforced in the case of officers whose conduct is good and who are certified by their superior officers to be thoroughly efficient. As the Chief Superintendent of Telegraphs at Glasgow was reported to be thoroughly efficient, I decided that, in accordance with the foregoing rule, he might be allowed to remain in the service for the present. I do not consider it advisable to make retirement at sixty years of age compulsory in every case.

Scottish Churches Commission—Publication of Report.

SIR T. GLEN-COATS (Renfrewshire, W.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the delay in presenting the Report of the Scottish Churches Commission is causing inconvenience, especially owing to the uncertainty as to the allocation of the theological colleges; and whether he can say when the Commission will report.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I would refer my hon. friend to the reply given by me on June 13th to a Question put to the Prime Minister by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Inverness Burghs, † which is the latest information at present in my possession. If further information is desired, I shall be glad to endeavour to obtain it.

Sale of Morrogh Bernard Estate, County Kerry.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet sanctioned the sale of the Morrogh Bernard estate, county Kerry; whether they have dealt with the claims of the evicted tenants on the estate fully; and whether they have arrived at any decision that would have the effect of excluding from the sale the evicted farms at Kilnarovanagh and Faha and thereby prevent the evicted tenants of these farms from being reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the sale of the estate mentioned has not yet been sanctioned. The sale will be dealt with in order of priority. The applications of the evicted tenants have not been finally dealt with, nor has any decision been arrived at which would have the effect of closing the sales without a full consideration of the cases of these evicted tenants.

Civil Rights of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education have yet arrived at any decision as to the Amendments which they propose to make in the rules affecting the civil rights of teachers; if not, at what time can he make an announcement on the subject; and whether he can see his way to recommend the Commissioners to make the rules in this respect similar to the rules in England, so that Irish teachers will possess equal freedom with teachers in other parts of the Empire.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they have amended their rules by removing the prohibition against the attendance of teachers at fairs, markets, and public meetings other than meetings held for political purposes. The amended rules read as follows:—"Rule 89 (a). The attendance of teachers at meetings held for political purposes, or the taking part in elections for Members of Parliament, or for poor law guardians, etc., except by voting, is incompatible with the performance of their duties, and is a violation of rule rendering them liable to withdrawal of salary. Rule 94 (III.). Teachers are required to act in a spirit of obedience to the law and of loyalty to the Sovereign." The Commissioners have also decided that there is no objection to the recognition of a national teacher as a chairman, vice-chairman, or member of the committee of a college for summer courses in Irish.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 964.

Blackburn Pupil Teachers Centre.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that Dr. Scott, an Inspector of the Board, advised the Blackburn education authority to abolish their pupil teacher centre on the grounds that the local grammar and high school furnish an education possessing superior culture and refinement; whether the Blackburn authority were unable to accept this view, and Dr. Scott then declared that the technical school, in which the centre was held, was an unsuitable building, and that the Board of Education, having determined to abolish pupil teacher centres, must require the local authority to at once proceed to find accommodation for the pupil teachers elsewhere; and whether he will give such instructions as shall preserve that form of professional training which the success of the centre justifies and which the Blackburn authority desire to continue.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My attention has been called to the case by the hon. Member's Question. So far as I can ascertain, the facts are by no means as stated in the Question: the grounds named by the inspector as pointing to the desirability (not the necessity) of a change of plan were not, I understand, those alleged in the Question; and the decision that the existing buildings were unsuitable had been made and announced quite independently of the question of whether secondary schools are generally speaking desirable places for the education of intending teachers. The Answer to the third paragraph is practically contained in my Answer to the hon. Member's previous Question on this subject.

Eyeglasses for School Children.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): To ask the President of the Board of Education if the promised Amendment to Clause 35 of the Education Bill, dealing with medical inspection, will include a provision authorising local authorities to provide glasses for such children as are found to be of defective eyesight.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Amendment which the Government inserted in the clause dealt only with medical inspection, which was made compulsory. The point referred to in the hon. Member's Question would therefore not fall within it, but would come, if at all, within the remainder of paragraph (b) of Clause 35. On this I have to say that I am not prepared to give a general interpretation beforehand as to the various individual matters which would fall within the powers of a local authority under the term "such arrangements as may be sanctioned by the Board of Education pertaining to the health and physical condition of the children educated in the public elementary schools," since the clause throws upon the Board the duty of giving hereafter such sanction as it may think justified by the circumstances of each individual case.

Land Commissions and Irish Estates.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if he can state why the Estates Commissioners do not, in accordance with the regulations now in force and the decision in the Blake-Foster case, refuse to deem land an estate in every case in which the agreed price exceeds the standard of true value of similar land ascertained by official valuers under former Purchase Acts; and why they sanction prices five years purchase higher than that standard without any economic justification.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that in administering the Irish Land Act of 1903 they have due regard to the regulations now in force and to the principles laid down in the decision in the Blake-Forster case. They are not aware of any such official standard of true value as that alluded to by the hon. Member.

Tibet Papers.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state when further papers on the agreement with Tibet will be laid upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The hon. Member was informed on May 23rd, † in reply to a Question addressed to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, as to the Papers which will be presented as soon as the Convention is ratified. The exchange of ratifications may be expected to take place shortly.

Purchase of Three Year old Horses for the Army.

MR. H. R. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the present practice of purchasing Army horses only after they have reached the age of five years is one which is viewed by British farmers with much disfavour; and whether he will consider the advisability of establishing depots so that horses can be purchased at three years instead.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This proposal has been frequently considered, but the large annual expenditure involved has been held to be prohibitive, and there appears to be little likelihood of the difficulty of providing money for the purpose being got over in the near future. I am not aware that the present practice is viewed with great disfavour by British farmers.

Army—Indian Drafts.

LORD CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): To ask the Secretary of State for War what was the number of troops, by arms, despatched to India in units and detachments respectively in the years 1904 and 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The figures for the years ending September, 1904 and 1905, which will be found in the general Annual Reports, are as follows:—

	1904.		1905.	
	Units.	Detachments.	Units.	Detachments.
Cavalry of Line - - - - -	1,189	195	563	600
Royal Horse and Field Artillery - -	398	1,036	239	1,368
Royal Garrison Artillery - - -	370	579	144	940
Infantry of Line - - - - -	1,174	9,985	2,684	8,751
Army Ordnance Corps - - - -	3	8	3	20
Totals - - -	3,134	11,803	3,633	11,679

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii, 1268.

Battalions Serving on Short Tour.

LORD CASTLEREAGH: To ask the Secretary of State for War what battalions are at present serving on short tour; what is the number of the rank and file of each such battalion; and how many men in each battalion are respectively under twenty years of age, and under two years service, and under one year's service.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)—

Battalions at present on short tour.

Unit.	Strength of rank and file on 1st July, 1906.	Numbers under			
		20 years of age.	2 years service.	1 year's service.	
Norfolk Regiment, 2nd Battalion - - -	682	113	159	85	Prematurely Abroad.
Royal Sussex Regiment, 2nd Battalion - -	752	147	233	79	
Essex Regiment, 2nd Battalion - - - -	709	220	355	98	
Royal West Kent Regiment, 1st Battalion -	692	156	247	88	
Royal Munster Fusiliers, 2nd Battalion - -	644	198	288	106	
Rifle Brigade, 1st Battalion	688	90	70	—	

NOTE.—The numbers "under 1 year's service" are included in the "under 2 years service," and a number of those "under 20 years of age" would be included in both these categories of service.

Army Reductions—Disposal of Redundant Soldiers.

MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): To ask the Secretary of State for War what number of private soldiers now actually serving the King will be redundant under the reduction proposed to be made in the artillery and in the rest of the regular forces respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The disposal of the soldiers in the branches affected by the reductions is receiving most careful consideration, and until the details connected with drafts and establishments have been more fully dealt with, I shall be unable to give the figures for which my hon. friend asks.

Civil Employment of ex-Soldiers and Sailors.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War on what date and what action does he propose taking to give effect to the recommendations as set forth on pages 29 and 30 of the Report of the Committee on Civil Employment of ex-Soldiers and Sailors [Cd. 2991].

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The recommendations of the Report have been approved in principle by the Army Council, and the measures necessary to carry them into effect are at present under consideration.

Battalions to be disbanded—Present Deficiency in Establishment.

MR. STEWART SMITH (Westmoreland, Kendal): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the deficiency of establishment in the eight battalions of the line which it is intended to disband; and whether any reason other than deficiency of establishment has led to his selection of these battalions for disbandonment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The regiments were selected in consequence of the difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of recruits in this and past years, and not for any other reason. The battalions selected were those last raised. The total deficiencies of each regiment are as follows:—

	Officers.	Other Ranks.
Northumberland Fusiliers - - - - -	6	449
Royal Warwickshire - - - - - -	4	437
Lancashire Fusiliers - - - - - -	6	518
Manchester - - - - - - -	—	542

Army Reductions—Employment for Field Officers of Garrison Artillery Militia.

COLONEL WALKER (Lancashire, Widnes): To ask the Secretary of State for War how he proposes to find employment for field officers of the garrison artillery Militia, seeing that the ammunition column of a brigade of field artillery is commanded by a captain.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This, with other questions affecting the Militia artillery, is receiving consideration, and I am not at present able to give a reply.

The Lancashire Artillery Militia.

COLONEL WALKER: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether in return for the past services of the Lancashire Artillery Militia, covering a period of fifty-three years, and whose records for efficiency have been maintained throughout, although their work has been the most responsible undertaken by garrison artillery, namely, the defences of Portsmouth in the sea forts of Horsesand, No Man, and Spit, and in lieu of Volunteers being asked to conduct this work under circumstances which cannot suit their periods of drill, he will either allow the Lancashire Artillery to continue the same work or else permit them to be amalgamated with their own off-shoot, the Lancashire Field Artillery Militia.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Lancashire garrison artillery Militia cannot be treated differently from the other regiments of garrison artillery Militia.

Reduction in the Royal Field Artillery.

MAJOR McMICKING (Kirkcudbrightshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War what reduction, if any, in the numbers of officers, non-commissioned officers, gunners, and drivers, respectively, at present on the establishment of the Royal Field Artillery will result owing to the reduction proposed to be made in the Royal Artillery.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The reductions in the establishments of the Royal Horse and Field Artillery referred to, amount to sixty-seven officers and 3,712 other ranks.

Return Home of Regiments to be disbanded now in South Africa.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary of State for War, when the regiments now in South Africa, which are to be disbanded, will return home; and by what troops these regiments are to be replaced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I regret that I am unable at present to give the hon. Member the information for which he asks.

Reinstatement of Corporal Jordan, Royal Scots Fusiliers, to his Original Rank of Quartermaster-Sergeant.

MR. LEA: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will explain why Corporal Jordan, Royal Scots Fusiliers, who, as quartermaster-sergeant, was tried by the district court-martial at Aldershot for statements he made against his commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel O'Leary, Commandant of the School of Signalling, and reduced to corporal, has been reinstated into his former rank.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) On the review of the proceedings of this court-martial, the Judge Advocate-General recommended the Secretary of State to quash the proceedings on the ground that the evidence did not justify the conviction. This non-commissioned officer has, consequently, been relieved from all consequences of his trial.

Third Coldstream Guards—Date of Departure for Egypt.

MR. JOHN RUTHERFORD (Lancashire, Darwen): To ask the Secretary of State for War, when the 3rd battalion of the Coldstream Guards will proceed to Egypt, and how long will it remain there.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The details of this move have not yet been decided.

Resignation of John P. O'Connor, Assistant Teacher, Kanturk No. 1 School.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether, in view of the number of dismissals of national teachers in Ireland since 1900, the Commissioners of Education can state the reasons assigned for the dismissal of John P. O'Connor, assistant teacher, Kanturk No. 1 School, who was retired in 1904, notwithstanding that he was considered a competent teacher and held a certificate in drawing and music.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that Mr. John P. O'Connor was assistant teacher in Kanturk boys' national school from 1st July 1896 to 29th September 1904, when he resigned his position, and was stated to have emigrated. He was not dismissed by the Commissioners.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants—Cases of James Culhane, and Mrs. Anne Connell.

MR. FLYNN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are now in possession of information respecting the holdings of the evicted tenants, James Culhane, Ballygraddy, and Mrs. Anne Connell, Coolmahane, both in Kanturk Union, county Cork; and whether the Commissioners will enter into communication with the present occupiers with a view to effecting such a friendly arrangement as may lead to the reinstatement of these evicted tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners have referred the applications lodged by the two persons named to one of their inspectors for inquiry, but his Report in the matter has not yet been received.

Royal Dublin Society's Inquiry into Administration of Intermediate Education Act.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at the request of the secretary of the Schoolmistresses' Association, the council of the Royal Dublin Society appointed a sub-committee to inquire into and report on the administration of The Intermediate Education Act, 1881; and will he take steps to ascertain the nature of that report and its recommendations.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state who was responsible for the Royal Society of Dublin dropping their inquiry into the administration of The Intermediate Education Act, 1881.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the Registrar of the Royal Dublin Society that in the year 1897 the Science Committee of that Society, at the instance of one of its members, appointed a sub-committee to consider the provision made by the Board of Intermediate Education for encouraging the teaching of science. In the following year the sub-committee presented a report on the subject, and having done so, its duty was discharged, and it automatically ceased to exist. I understand that the sub-committee's report was published in the Annual Report of the Royal Dublin Society for the year 1898.

Purchase by Federated Malay States of Shares in Tanjong Pagar Dock Company.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Federated Malay States have purchased a block of shares in the Tanjong Pagar Dock Company; if so, what was the profit on the basis of the award; if, after notice of expropriation was given, the market price remained at $240 why did the Government not buy them; was any effort made to come to terms with the company previous to resorting to the expedient of arbitration; did the company make any offer to dispose of their undertaking for a guaranteed interest of 12 per cent. on the par value of the shares; will he explain why the Colony is to be saddled with a charge representing three times the market value of the shares; had the Colony any voice in the question of the method of purchase; what fees were granted to the arbitrator, umpire, council, and others; and when does he expect to be able to lay Papers recording this transaction.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Taking the sentences of the hon. Member's Question in order:—(1) and (2). Shares have been purchased at different times by the Government of the Federated Malay States as an investment of surplus funds, but I am not aware of the purchase price in each case and, therefore, I cannot state what the profit will amount to. (3). The market price did not remain at $240, and in any case it would not have been proper for the Government to speculate on the results of the award by making further purchases after notice of expropriation had been given. (4). I have answered this Question in my reply to the hon. Member of the 12th instant; (5). I am not aware that such an offer was made; (6) the amount of the award was determined by the umpire; it will be a charge on the assets of the Dock Board; the Ordinance (a copy of which I have already placed in the Library of the House) was passed with only two dissentients, who were directors of the company; (8) in view of the possible taxation of costs I am unable at present to state what expenditure will be entailed upon the Colony in all the cases referred to by the hon. Member; (9) I will expedite the presentation of Papers as much as possible, and I hope that they may be distributed before Parliament is prorogued, but I cannot commit myself to a definite undertaking at present.

Applications for Raising of the Rate for Higher Education.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state how many applications were made by county councils in each of the years 1903, 1904, and 1905, for the consent of the Board under Section 2 of the Education Act, 1902, to the raising of a rate for purposes of higher education exceeding two pence in the pound; and when, and by what county councils, each of such applications was made, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) There were no applications of the kind in 1903 or 1904; but in 1905 two such applications were received from the county councils of Anglesey and Merioneth respectively. In each of these cases I consented to the raising by the county council for the purposes of higher education of a sum not exceeding the amount which would be produced by a rate of three pence in the pound for one year.

Speed Limit of Motor Omnibuses in the Metropolitan Area.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what speed limit he has ordered to be observed by motor omnibuses within the metropolitan area.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Motor omnibuses within the metropolitan area would usually come within the regulations madeby the Local Government Board with regard to heavy motor cars. The provision as to speed is contained in Article VII. of these regulations, which is as follows:—Article VII. The speed at which a heavy motor car is driven on any highway shall not exceed eight miles an hour. Provided that—(a) if the weight of the heavy motor car unloaded exceeds three tons; or (b) if the registered axle-weight of any axle exceeds six tons; or (c) if the heavy motor car draws a trailer, the speed shall not exceed five miles an hour. Provided also that if the heavy motor car has all its wheels fitted with pneumatic tyres or with tyres made of a soft or elastic material, the speed at which the heavy motor car may be driven on any highway shall not exceed (a) twelve miles an hour where the registered axle-weight of any axle does not exceed six tons; and (b) eight miles an hour where the registered axle-weight of any axle exceeds six tons.

Delay in Delivery of Letters at Ardara, County Donegal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the letters are not delivered at Ardara, County Donegal, on the arrival of the mid-day train; whether he has received memorials from the inhabitants of that town complaining of the delay in the delivery of these letters, and the consequent loss and inconvenience to which they are thereby subjected; and whether he will take steps to secure the speedy delivery of the mid-day mail in Ardara.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No applications respecting the delivery at Ardara have reached me, but I have called for a Report on the subject, and on its receipt I will communicate with the hon. Member.

New Site for Monaghan Post Office.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Postmaster-General if it is intended to further postpone the purchase of the site for the Monaghan post office; and, if so, will he take into consideration the present unsanitary conditions under which the officials perform their duty, and instruct the proper officials to proceed with the purchase of the new site forthwith.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is not intended to postpone the purchase of the site longer than is absolutely necessary. Every effort is being made to dispose of certain outstanding legal questions, and I believe there is a good prospect of their being settled soon.

The Petroleum Act and the Thames Conservancy By-laws.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the bye-laws of the Thames Conservancy, under the Act of 1894, having reference to the Petrolenm Acts of 1871 and 1879, give the Conservancy control over the import only of petroleum spirit, but do not give any control over such spirit when once landed when moved from the landing-place by water, whether up the river or seawards; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am aware of the defect of the existing law in the matter referred to, and I hope to deal with it by legislation when I have an opportunity.

Accrington Education Authority and the Hyndburn Park School.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is now in a position to state the decision of the Board with regard to the proposal of the Accrington Education Authority to open the Hyndburn Park School as one large mixed department, though the plans upon which the loan was sanctioned provided for two mixed departments; and, in particular, can he say whether the Board adhere to the view expressed in their letter of 17th May last on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The decision of the Board in this case was sent to the Local Education Authority on the 7th July. I will send the hon. Member a copy of this reply, which will give him the information he desires.

Elementary Schools—Suspension of Improvements Pending Passing of the Education Bill.

COLONEL WARDE (Kent, Medway): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether until the Education Bill now before Parliament becomes law, he will refrain from making any further orders involving expenditure as to improvements, etc., in elementary school buildings; and whether he will authorise the suspension of works not yet carried out, in view of the possibility of the schools thus affected not being effectually taken over by the local authorities?

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I cannot undertake, and it would be improper for me to think of doing so, to refrain from requiring such improvements in school buildings as may be needed for the health of the scholars or for their efficient instruction. But I will arrange that due regard shall be paid to present circumstances in the case of any matters in which some delay would not be prejudicial to the interests of the children involved.

Salaries of Assistant Clerks (New Class).

MR. SNOWDEN: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that there are many assistant clerks (new class) who are over thirty years of age, and who, despite the fact that they have served for ten or more years in the public service, receive only about 30s. per week; and whether, taking into account the age of the clerks referred to, and to the fact that they have to support life under the conditions consequent upon residence in a large city, he will consider the advisability of raising their pay to the rate of a living wage.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Even before the scale was improved in July, 1902, assistant clerks of the new class, the limits of age for which are nineteen to twenty-one, reached a salary of £80 per annum after eight years' service. Under the present scale £80 is reached after five years' service. I see no reason for any change.

Great Northern Railway of Ireland—3rd Class Passengers and Mail Trains.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the statement of the Great Northern Railway of Ireland that their reason for not carrying third-class passengers on their mail trains is in order to obtain the punctual working of the mails, whether he can state if the carrying of third-class passengers dislocates the mail service on any other railway line in Great Britain; whether he is aware that the later train, being a slow train, does not at all meet the requirements of business men; and whether he will cause further inquiry to be made

(*Awswered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am unable to say whether on other railways than the Great Northern of Ireland it is found that the carrying of local third-class passengers interferes with the punctual working of the mails. I will call the company's attention to the representation with regard to the later train and will inform the hon. Member of the result.

Disbanding of Volunteer Artillery.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the men composing the 3rd Kent (Woolwich Arsenal) Artillery Volunteers will be employed on other than military duties in time of war, it is proposed to disband the corps; and, if so, when will the disbandment take place; and whether the Elswick Volunteer Artillery will be dealt with in the same manner and on the same grounds.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not able at the present moment to make any detailed statements in regard to the Volunteer Artillery.

Army Supplies—Hackford Provision Company.

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Secretary of State for War how firms are selected for tendering for Army supplies; and if he can say whether the Hackford Provision Company, Brixton, have ever got an opportunity of tendering or have at any recent time been contractors for supplies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Any firm wishing to tender for Army supplies should write direct to the Secretary, War Office. The company referred to is not known by the War Office.

The Army Reduction—Transfer of Men.

MR. GIBBS: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is to happen to those officers and men who are at present serving in the battalions which are to be disbanded.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This question is now under consideration.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Gunnery Practice in the North Sea.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Sheerness Reserve Division, consisting of three battleships and five cruisers, proceeded into the North Sea for five days quarterly practice on April 23rd last, that by order of the Rear Admiral commanding the division the whole of its one-inch aiming and light quick-firing ammunition was expended in half a day by being fired at towing targets, while in the case of the heavy gun firing only two ships were permitted to use the proper range near the Tongue lightship, the remainder being forced to expend their ammunition in great haste in order to comply with the Admiral's orders as to rejoining the Flag; whether he is further aware that H.M.S. "Vindictive" on this occasion expended the whole of her sixty rounds of six-inch ammunition in ten minutes, using only one broadside for the purpose; whether the use of towing-targets for quarterly practice is not now officially regarded as obsolete; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be made into the responsibility of the Rear Admiral in question for so serious a departure from the regulations and consequent waste of both training and ammunition.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): No report has yet been received, but inquiry is being made, and I will communicate the result to the hon. Member in due course.

German Naval Statistics.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what reserve of heavy guns is maintained by the German Navy for battleships carrying four heavy guns each; and whether the guns in German fortifications generally correspond to the guns on board the ships.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: So many Questions have recently been addressed to me on the subject of foreign Navy Estimates, programmes, and policy that I am constrained to ask my hon. friend and other hon. Members to excuse me from making statements on subjects as to which the Board of Admiralty have no official knowledge and can take no responsibility.

The Operations in Natal—Treatment of Wounded Natives.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state the number of natives who have been killed, the number wounded, and the number who have surrendered and are now prisoners of war, in connection with the military operations now being conducted against them by the Colonial forces in South Africa.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The following information has been received from the Governor—Approximate number of natives killed, 3,500; approximate number of natives taken prisoners or who surrendered, including wounded, 2,000. No official record has been kept differentiating between the surrendered and those taken prisoners. The Government has information that a large number of the natives who were wounded in the various fights found their way back to their kraals, and these people were notified through the magistrates of the districts that medical aid will be given if applied for.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: But we have been told that the kraals have been destroyed and burnt. How can the wounded find shelter in them?

MR. CHURCHILL: There is another Question on the Paper, the reply to which deals with that point.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Does not the proportion of the surrendered and wounded to the killed bear out to a very great extent the fears of some hon. Members?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion or argument.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Has the hon. Gentleman's attention been called to cablegrams reporting the contradiction of the Natal Government of the report that their officers gave orders to the soldiers and native levies that no prisoners were to be taken?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, sir.

MR. DALZIEL (Kircaldy Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now able to state the number of natives killed after the Mome Valley fight; and will he say if Bambaata's head was cut off and exposed.

for two days before burial; whether he has any information of the number of prisoners that have been taken during the War in Natal; and whether the Imperial Government are in any way directly represented at the seat of hostilities?

MR. CHURCHILL: The following telegram has been received this morning from the Governor of Natal in reply to an inquiry addressed to him in consequence of the statement which appeared in the *Daily Mail* for Monday:—"I have laid your telegrams of July 16th, No. 2, before Ministers, who desire me to send to you following reply. Begins it is not the case that 3,000 natives have been killed in Natal since the Mome fight, as the total number of the killed throughout the whole of the operations is only 3,500, *vide* return given in your Excellency's telegram, No. 1 of to-day. Government has received no information that the wounded were killed by native levies. It is of course possible that levies away from the observation of the European officers may have killed the badly wounded and it would be quite impossible to prevent it, but the Commandant of Militia is certain that this has not been done during the present rebellion to the same extent as in former times. During the Zulu war it was common knowledge that the British native levies did kill the wounded, and to take one example, at the battle of the Inyazana it it was reported both by Europeans and natives that the greater proportion of the wounded had been killed and that very few if any prisoners were taken. Government has received following report relative to the decapitation of Bambaata:—Begins. It was intimated to the officer commanding the troops that the dead body of Bambaata was lying at the bottom of a gorge about 2,000 feet below the camp, and as it was most essential that it should be ascertained definitely whether Bambaata was really killed or not, Major Platt, Natal Medical Corps, with a number of natives, was sent down to bring up the body for the purposes of identification. On reaching the spot where the body lay it was found to be in an advanced stage of decomposition, and as the natives refused to carry it to camp, decapitation was absolutely necessary to ensure definite identification by responsible persons acquainted with Bambaata. The head was not exhibited but was kept covered and in privacy under an armed guard and was only shown to persons who stated that they knew Bambaata intimately and would be able to recognise him. When the identification was complete and it was proved beyond doubt that the head was that of Bambaata it was returned to the spot and interred with the body." Ends. The statement that the troops gave no quarter is untrue and this is proved by the fact that about 2,000 rebel prisoners as far as can be at the present time ascertained are now in custody. The enemy's wounded have been attended where possible by the medical staff. In some cases the wounded having been attended to were left on the field to be taken care of by their friends. Troops are searching the country but rebels are being given every opportunity to surrender. Burning the kraals has been strictly forbidden except when military exigencies require it.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Barbarous.

MR. CHURCHILL: The distinction is perfectly clear. Cattle belonging to rebels have been taken by troops on behalf of the Government but not as private loot. The point with regard to the firing of grass is not understood, as this is a common practice throughout the Colony at this time of the year. The officer commanding troops denies absolutely the truth of the allegation that prisoners were shot when breaking up camp. With reference to the third part of the Question, I have already given the information asked for in answering the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. With reference to the fourth part, Major General Stephenson was with the troops from the middle of May until the middle of June on the nomination of the general officer commanding South-Africa with the object of keeping the latter informed on all matters of military interest.

MR. DALZIEL: Having regard to the practical admission by the Under-Secretary that the native levies have been guilty of killing the wounded, I desire to know whether the Imperial Government will bring their influence to bear at once to stop the employment of native levies; and I would ask what further action it is proposed to take in the whole matter, and also whether the

Government will lay the Reports of the officer who has been present throughout the war in Natal.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is quite impossible for me to answer a matter of such importance without notice; it is perfectly obvious it is a matter that can only be decided by the Secretary of State and also by the Cabinet. With regard to the last part of the Question, I am not aware whether we have any Reports in our possession which have been handed in by Major-General Stephenson, but I will inquire and consider whether they are Reports which can be laid on the Table with advantage.

MR. DALZIEL: I shall address the Question to the Prime Minister.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Has the Government conveyed any comment upon the manner in which the body of this Zulu chief was treated; do they approve of it, in point of fact, and is it conceivable for a single moment that if this had been a white foe his body would have been so treated.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am afraid the British Government is not in the best position in regard to the incident of the decapitation of Bambaata, for, as the hon. Gentleman will remember, under the late Administration, after the battle of Omdurman, the Madhi's head was most shamefully decapitated, and I think it is quite obvious that such an evil precedent would be quoted against us by a Colony in reply to any remonstrance we might think it necessary to make. As to whether any protest has been made, I may tell the House that I am informed that the Ministers in Natal and the Governor of Natal were greatly astonished at the statements which were telegraphed out to South Africa after they had appeared in the English papers. As soon as those statements were cabled out, Sir Henry M'Callum at once telegraphed to the Prime Minister as follows:—"I cannot believe that this can be true. If it has been allowed"—that is, the killing of the wounded—"immediate orders must be given for any such practice to stop, and Colonel Mackenzie must give an immediate explanation." The reply of the Ministers of the Natal Government I have already read to the House. I am also informed that the native levies have been kept in the strictest control that was possible, having regard to the broken nature of the country, and that out of thousands of native women who have been involved in the area affected by the operations only one case of assault has been heard of.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): I do not understand the parallel which the hon. Gentleman has made. But does he or does he not impute any disgraceful act to the officer concerned in taking these steps for the identification of this man?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, I do not myself consider—for after all it is a point I have to answer without consultation—that the steps taken by the officer in Natal were half so discreditable to civilisation as the steps that were taken with regard to the Mahdi.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not understand condemnation by innuendo. What I desire to know is whether the hon. Member does impute a disgraceful act to this officer. As he has left the matter, a disgraceful imputation is made against him.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are we now to enter into questions affecting a war of five or six years ago?

*MR. SPEAKER: I think it would be undesirable to do so. I am afraid the topic was introduced by the Minister who replied.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: May I ask whether the Under-Secretary has any information to show at what date the prisoners were taken prisoners, whether before the Mome slaughter or since then?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, but I shall be very glad to get information if the hon. Gentleman desires it.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would answer my Question, whether he does impute [MINISTERIAL cries of "Notice"]—no notice was given of the imputation—disgraceful conduct to this officer or not?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have answere

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. Member has told us that he did not consider the conduct of this officer as bad as the conduct of some other officers. I want to know whether the hon. Member does impute disgraceful conduct to this officer or not.

MR. DALZIEL: May I ask the Prime Minister, having regard to the fact that the telegram which has been read excuses and admits the action of the native levies in killing the wounded, what steps, if any, the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): As far as I followed what my hon. friend read, I did not understand that there was any disposition to excuse or admit such practices. It was said that where native levies were out of the ken and observation of European officers they might resort to practices of that sort, but they had no knowledge of its having been done, and were greatly surprised by the extraordinary telegrams, issuing, I believe, from Johannesburg, which imputed wholesale massacre or ill-treatment of the wounded.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: May I ask the Under-Secretary whether he relies upon absolute information within the War Office, or the Colonial Office, that the head of the Khalifa——

MR. SPEAKER: I think it would be better not to go back to that again.

MR. DALZIEL: Is it not the case that in the Answer read to-day the statement occurs that the killing was not so serious as has been the case formerly, and is that not an indirect excuse for the action that has taken place?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, it is an expression of regret that the means of restraint had not been more effective.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is the Prime Minister aware that the accusation was not contained in telegrams from Johannesburg, but in letters from private soldiers who said they had taken part in the butchery, and will the right hon. Gentleman obtain some authentic information on that point?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We cannot inquire into a letter by a private soldier unless we know who he is; but we have made at once the fullest inquiry, and we have received a very full reply already. Any further point that requires elucidation we shall be only too happy to inquire into.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Can the Government give any information as to the method by which these Press telegrams are worked for a political object?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have a slight suspicion myself, but I cannot say that I am acquainted with the facts. I have nothing to do myself with the manipulation of the Press, and if I were to start to do it I do not know how I should set about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Appoint another Royal Commission.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): If there was nothing to conceal why was a censorship of the Press established?

Seamen's Remittances.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can see his way to remit that part of the charge of 3d. in the pound, levied on the remittance home of British seamen's wages from Hamburg and other foreign ports, which is now retained by the British Consuls in those ports.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury, for Sir EDWARD GREY): The matter is now under the consideration of His Majesty's Government.

MAJOR SEELY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can see his way to remit that part of the charge of threepence in the pound levied on the remittance home of British seamen's wages from Hamburg and other foreign ports, which is now retained by the Board of Trade.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon

Boroughs): The whole question is receiving the careful consideration of the three Departments concerned, namely, the Treasury, the Foreign Office, and the Board of Trade.

San Thomé and Principé.

MR. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has now received the Consular Report dealing with the labour conditions in the Islands of San Thomé and Principé.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Answer is in the negative. His Majesty's Consul at Boma has, however, been reminded by telegraph of the desire of His Majesty's Government to be furnished with his Report as soon as possible.

Vaccination Exemptions at Lincoln.

MR. H. R. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that recently the magistrates of the city of Lincoln granted a vaccination exemption certificate to a parent residing in the county of Lincoln and outside the jurisdiction of the Lincoln city magistrates; and, in view of the difficulty in securing certificates from some benches of magistrates, will any objection be taken by the Local Government Board to certificates being granted by justices other than those acting for the area in which applicants reside.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. My attention has not been called to this case. It appears to me that the proper course for justices is to refuse to deal with applications for certificates when parent and child are resident outside their jurisdiction; but if in such circumstances Justices grant a certificate it is not for me to take objection to it.

Police Inquiries.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, in making local inquiries in connection with applications for licences, the verification of signatures, the substantiality of sureties and other matters, it is the present custom to employ police constables in uniform; and whether he will consider the possibility of directing that all visits in connection with such matters shall, in future, be made by men in plain clothes.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware of the usual custom referred to. I concur in the opinion of the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police that no change in existing practice could be made without grave inconvenience and that in the great majority of the inquiries referred to there is an advantage in having the officer in uniform. When circumstances indicate a different course as desirable, an officer in plain clothes is sent for the purpose.

Returns of Criminal Prosecutions.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has now had an opportunity of considering with the Director of Public Prosecutions the question of omitting from future Returns of criminal prosecutions the actual names of acquitted parties.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir; and the Director of Public Prosecutions will omit from future Returns the names of acquitted persons.

New Zealand Exports.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the trade returns of New Zealand show that since the passing of the Preferential Trade Act, 1903, the value of New Zealand exports to places within the Empire has largely increased while the export of goods to countries without the Empire has diminished; whether he will state the percentage of increase that has taken place in the value of goods exported from the United Kingdom to New Zealand since 1902; and whether he has any information showing the results of the working of preferential relations between the United Kingdom and other Colonies.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The preference accorded by New Zealand to British goods came into operation in November, 1903. A comparison of the statistics for 1903 and 1905 shows that the total exports from New Zealand to places within the Empire increased from £14,166,683 to £14,679,620, or 3½ per cent., while the total exports to places outside the Empire increased from £843,695 to £976,327 or 15¾ per cent. During the same period the exports of British produce from the United Kingdom to New Zealand increased from £6,361,390 to £6,425,793, or 1 per cent. Comparisons, however, between the figures for single years are apt to be somewhat misleading. As regards the last part of the Question, statistics of British exports to other Colonies can be given for a series of years, but (except in the case of Canada) the institution of preference has been too recent to enable any safe inference to be drawn as to its effect on the figures.

Birmingham Celebrations—Continental Torches.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the growing trade in torches between Germany and Great Britain; whether he is aware that at a recent demonstration in Birmingham 5,000 German torches were used, and that none of them were marked made in Germany; and whether, as the sale of such articles without such a mark constitutes an infringment of the Trade Marks Act, he can state why these were allowed to be imported, and whether any legal proceedings will follow on their importation.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have no official information on the subject of the hon. Member's Question, but I should be glad to think that the followers and admirers of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham enjoyed and appreciated for at least one evening the advantages of free trade. I have great doubt if there was any contravention of the Merchandise Marks Acts, but in any case action would be difficult, as I understand that the last particle of evidence as to the nationality of the torches was consumed in the course of the festivities.

MR. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of suggesting to the promoters of celebrations, such as these, the giving of preference to the Colonies in the matter of such contracts, especially as Canada has enough forests to supply torches to all the country?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Protection has gone to blazes.

MR. PAUL (Northampton): Will the Home Secretary offer a reward for the detection of the guilty party?

Motor 'Bus Brakes

MR. SCARISBRICK (Dorsetshire, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the accidents that have recently occurred to motor 'buses, he will take steps to revise the regulations of the Local Government Board, by making it compulsory for every motor 'bus to have an extra emergency brake at the rear of the car under the control of the conductor.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I will give consideration to the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Literature for the Blind—Postage Rates.

VISCOUNT VALENTIA (Oxford): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is now in a position to make a statement in regard to the reduction in the postage on literature for the blind, which he promised in his speech on Post Office Estimates.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I hope to be able to carry out a considerable reduction in the postage on literature for the blind very shortly. A book printed in type for the blind consists of two to three, and sometimes four volumes, for each volume printed in the ordinary type, while the volumes themselves are bulky and heavy. Thus the existing postage rates involve a very serious charge on the blind because of their affliction. I am advised, however, that these reductions cannot be made by Treasury Warrant under the existing Post Office Acts, and that it is necessary for the Porsmaster-General to obtain special powers. I am, therefore, to-day introducing a Bill which will give authority to the Postmaster-General to fix special postal rates in respect of books and papers impressed for the blind, and to make regulations in respect to their transmission by post. I venture to hope that the House will allow me to take the Bill as a non-contentious measure, in order that it may pass through all its stages before the adjournment, so that the proposed reductions can be put into force at an early date. Until the Bill has passed this House, I am afraid I cannot indicate the exact nature of the reductions I propose.

Postage Stamps at Railway Stations.

MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can see his way to make arrangements for the sale of postage stamps at the principal railway stations.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Railway companies as a rule are unwilling to sell stamps at their telegraph offices at railway stations; but Messrs. W. H. Smith and Sons have licences for the sale of stamps at all stations where they have bookstalls, and negotiations are in progress with Messrs. Wyman and Sons to the same end.

Postal Employees and Volunteer Camps.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether facilities will be afforded to the postal employees in Edinburgh and Leith district who are Volunteers, to enable them to attend camp for annual training.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The reply is in the affirmative, so far as the requirements of the postal service will admit.

MR. McCRAE: Have not all applications for leave for camps in July been refused?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have not heard so; I will inquire.

Pupil Teachers—Training Centres.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that school boards and local education authorities under the Act of 1902, acting under the advice and encouragement of the Board of Education, have established with successful results centres for the training of pupil teachers; whether he is aware that inspectors of the Board of Education are now stating that the present policy of the Board involves the closing of such centres, whether suitable or not, and the transference of the pupils to secondary schools during the two years of apprenticeship, such secondary schools being in many instances outside public control, and in some instances denominational in their tendency; and whether, having regard to the desirability of securing distinct professional training, under complete popular control, for pupil teachers, he will take the necessary measures to preserve such centres for the professional training of young teachers, while secondary schools continue to give that general and specialised instruction required by other students.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): Before the Act of 1902 school boards having had no power to conduct secondary schools were necessarily restricted to educating their pupil teachers in special classes or centres established solely for that purpose. Some of these have been continued since 1902 by the local education authorities, and some new ones have been established and recognised, usually on a temporary basis, pending the development of a secondary school. The Answer to the second paragraph is in the negative, except where it is manifestly desirable and possible to provide a decidedly better education for the pupil teachers by such a change. In reply to the third paragraph, I can only say that a good general education for these young persons between the ages of sixteen and twenty seems to me, and I believe to all educational experts, a matter of far greater importance than any attempt to develop in them at so early an age any special technical dexterity in handling large classes or other professional specialities, which can only be achieved by stunting their intellectual development at what is perhaps the most important stage of their mental growth.

Fetlar Fuel Supply.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that an important district in Fetlar is unable to supply itself with fuel, except at great risk to life and limb; and if he will permit an officer of the Congested Districts Board to visit the island and report.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): This matter has been before the Congested Districts Board, who in pursuance of their general policy decline to give a grant for the construction of a road into a peat moss. The Board are, however, prepared to send an officer to examine and report upon a bridge which it is understood is required, provided the persons locally responsible ask them to do so and supply requisite information as to the character of the work to be undertaken.

Sanitation in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the insanitary condition of the townships in the island of Lewis, as disclosed in Dr. Dithnar's Report, published upwards of a year ago, will he state the result of his application to the Treasury for the funds requisite to improve the sanitary condition of the island.

MR. SINCLAIR: The subject is still under consideration, and I regret to say that I can at present make no announcement upon it.

MR. WEIR: I was told that three months ago.

Vatersay Cottars.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the nature of the arrangements under which landless cottars, who recently seized the Isle of Vatersay, Outer Hebrides, have been allowed to remain.

MR. SINCLAIR: The island of Vatersay has not been seized by cottars, as stated by the hon. Member, but cattle belonging to cottars have been ferried over by them to the island and left to graze on lands in the occupation of the tenant farmer. I understand that the cattle are still there. I am not aware that any arrangements have been made.

MR. WEIR: Has not some of the land been taken?

MR. SINCLAIR: No, Sir, none has been seized.

Crofters Acts.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is now in a position to state on what date the promised Crofters Acts Amendment Bill will be introduced; and in view of the limited time at the disposal of the Government before the House rises, will the Bill be brought in under the ten minute Rule?

MR. SINCLAIR: I can at present add nothing to the reply given on Wednesday last to my hon. friend.†

MR. WEIR: I appeal to the Prime Minister—have the Government any honest intention of proceeding with this Bill, or do they intend to allow years to elapse before doing anything? Cannot he infuse any energy into the Scottish Office?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think there is any lack of energy. But this Bill raises larger questions than my hon. friend has any idea of. That is the reason for the delay.

MR. WEIR: Will it be introduced this year?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no other expectations.

Royal Canal—Board of Control.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now give the names of the new Members proposed to be added to the Board of Control of the Royal Canal; if not, can he give an assurance that they shall be Irishmen, not nominated or suggested by any railway company, but interested in the preservation and development of the canal for heavy traffic.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): The question of filling the two vacancies on the Board of Control of the Royal Canal is under consideration, but I am not yet in a position to make an announcement on the subject. There has been no idea of appointing anyone but an Irishman, nor has any nomination or suggestion been made by or invited from any railway company. Under the statute regulating the appointment, the persons to be appointed must not be shareholders of the Midland Great Western Railway Company or of any canal or inland navigation in Ireland. In reply to supplementary Questions of which the hon. Member has given me private notice, I beg to say that the Board of Control inform me that it is not the case that the Royal Canal is now in a worse state than ever before. It has been ascertained from the Midland Great Western Railway Company, that a one-horse boat carrying a cargo of from 45 to 50 tons can now be taken from Dublin to Mullingar in three days. Any question as to the action which is being taken by the Canal Commission should be addressed to my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx, 858.

Colonel Malone's Westmeath Estate.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the facts that Colonel Malone's Baronstown estate, Westmeath, was inspected prior to the instructions now in force and not in accordance with them, that the estate comprises three untenanted farms, Cumminstown, Baronstown, and Ballycorkey, and thirty-four tenants of uneconomic holdings, will those farms be distributed among those small tenants and other eligible persons in the neighbourhood; and, if the report before the Estates Commissioners be insufficient for this purpose, will further inquiry or inspection be made before any contrary ruling.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that there are no untenanted farms on that portion of Colonel Malone's estate which has been inspected and declared to be an estate for the purposes of sale. There are, however, two large tenanted farms upon the estate which is being sold, and these are occupied under agreements entered into more than twenty years ago. The Commissioners are considering the amount of the advances to be made for the purchase of these holdings, and do not think it necessary to have any further inquiry or inspection made.

Barrigone (Limerick) Evicted Tenant.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that John Houlihan was evicted from his holding at Morgan's, Barrigone, in the county of Limerick, in the year 1888, by the landlord, Mr. Charles Sands, since deceased; that application for reinstatement was made by him to the Estates Commissioners; that the landlady, Mrs. Mildred Sands, has sold the estate, under the Land Act, 1903, in which the evicted farm is situate; that in the year 1905 she made application to the Estates Commissioners to divide this evicted farm from her other lands adjoining it, with a view to reinstating the evicted tenant; that the Estates Commissioners have as yet done nothing in the matter; and will he say what is the reason for this neglect on their part.

*MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from John Houlihan an application for reinstatement in his former holding. It appears that the holding is occupied by Mrs. Sands, who purchased it and other lands as one holding under the Land Purchase Acts. Mrs. Sands has applied to the Land Commission for liberty to divide the lands so purchased by her with a view to the sale of the divided portions, and the Land Commission has consented to the division of the lands into lots. The Land Commission are not aware that any sale has yet taken place, and no application on the subject has been made by Mrs. Sands to the Estates Commissioners. The Estates Commissioners will favourably consider any application made to them with a view to the reinstatement of Houlihan, and, in any event, inquiry will, in due course, be made into the case by their local inspector.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will the Estates Commissioners before advancing any money in connection with the sale of the estate by Mrs. Sands see that Houlihan is re-instated?

*MR. BRYCE: I have no control over the Estates Commissioners. All I can do is to transmit the wishes expressed by the hon. Member. They have been vested with special control over these matters by Parliament.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: When the Act was passed was it not on the understanding that all these evicted tenants should be re-instated?

*MR. BRYCE: If so, then that would be a proper matter to bring under the notice of the Estates Commissioners.

Irish Magistracy.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Returns of the number of magistrates appointed in Ireland, dated March 14th, 1905, and March 22nd, 1906, from which it appears that from March, 1902, to March, 1906, 608 appointments to the Commission of the Peace were made, and that of this number 430 were non-Catholic and 178 Catholic; whether, seeing the Catholics number 80 per cent. of the population of Ireland, he can give any reason why the percentage of Catholics appointed to the magistracy and other public appointments are not equal to this proportion of the population, or at least equal to the number of non-Catholic appointments; and will he take steps to have appointed a number of Catholics equal to the non-Catholics who at present hold the Commission of the Peace.

*MR. BRYCE: The Returns to which the hon. Member refers show that the numbers of Catholic and non-Catholic magistrates appointed during the periods mentioned are as stated. Nearly all these appointments were made before His Majesty's present Government came into office. As regards the concluding inquiry, the Lord Chancellor informs me that he has been giving the matter careful consideration, and has already signed warrants for the appointment of 107 new county magistrates, of whom seventy-seven are Catholics. Other appointments have been arranged, and the warrants will be issued as soon as certain formalities have been completed.

Irish Land Commission—Mr. Wilkinson's Appointment.

MR. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware if Mr. Wilkinson, recently appointed to a position in the Irish Land Commission, still continues to carry on the business of a land agent, or assistant in a land agent's office; is he aware if Mr. Wilkinson frequently attends at the land agency offices between the hours of 10 a.m. and 5 p.m.; whether, under the rules of the Civil Service, an official is bound to serve in his office between the hours mentioned; and whether, if Mr. Wilkinson is employed in the land agency office, he will order Mr Wilkinson's services in the Land Commission to be discontinued, and a properly qualified member of the staff promoted to discharge the duties of the position which Mr. Wilkinson now occupies.

*MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Land Commission that it is not the case that Mr. Wilkinson continues to carry on the business of a land agent or assistant in a land agent's office, and that he does not attend at any land agency offices during the hours named. The Commissioners have knowledge that Mr. Wilkinson's time is wholly devoted to their services during official hours.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare): Will the right hon. Gentleman say out of what land agent's office Mr. Wilkinson came and who recommended him?

*MR. BRYCE: I have no knowledge.

Ballynoe (Cork) Evicted Tenant.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Mr. Timothy Donovan, evicted tenant, of Ballynoe, Kanturk Union, county Cork; and whether, in view of the fact that the holding is in the hands of the landlords, Messrs. Barry, of Kanturk, the Commissioners will communicate with them in the hope of effecting a friendly arrangement which may lead to the reinstatement of the evicted tenant.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from Timothy Donovan an application for reinstatement, and have approached the landlords' agent on the subject, but have not yet received his reply.

MR. FLYNN: Seeing that the land is in the hands of the landlords and there are no legal difficulties to overcome, cannot the Commissioners expedite matters?

MR. BRYCE: They are doing all they can in that direction; but it is not possible for all tenants to be reinstated in their former holdings, and in those cases efforts are made to find other holdings for them.

Boycotting Statistics.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of cases of attacks upon persons and property, malicious damage, boycotting, intimidation, and threatening letters reported to the constabulary in Ireland during the six months ended June 30th last; and the number of convictions obtained in respect of these offences.

MR. BRYCE: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that it was not possible to compile the required information in the short time since this Question was put down. If the hon. Member should think fit to renew the Question after a few days I shall be prepared to answer it.

MR. LONSDALE: I will repeat the Question in a few days.

St. John's Bridge, Kilkenny.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the County Council of Kilkenny and the Corporation of Kilkenny have agreed to jointly contribute the cost of rebuilding St. John's Bridge in Kilkenny city, but through an unforeseen defect in the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, they cannot do so; whether as the work in question would be one of public utility to the city, and county of Kilkenny and the adjoining counties, and further because of the employment its reconstruction would afford for unemployed artisans and labourers in Kilkenny during next winter, he will endeavour to induce the Government to afford the time necessary to pass into Law the Bill now before the House to remedy this defect.

MR. BRYCE: It is, I understand, the fact that the Kilkenny County Council and the Kilkenny Urban District Council have agreed to contribute jointly the cost of rebuilding the bridge referred to, and it is also the case that there is no provision in the Local Government (Ireland) Act enabling them to make a joint contribution for the purpose. The proposed work would certainly be one of public utility, but it is questionable whether the matter is of vital importance, having regard to the many competing claims upon the time of the House. The question, however, of affording facilities for the Bill is for my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, to whom I will represent the circumstances, together with any other considerations which the Hon. Member may desire to bring to notice.

Boycotting at Drumkeerin, Leitrim.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the scenes of disorder at Drumkeerin, county Leitrim, arising out of a boycot of Charles Brady, of Druminafinlo, who is in occupation of an evicted farm; whether he is aware that Brady has been obliged to purchase food for his family in places twenty miles and more from his home, that on Saturday, July 7th, he was assailed by a crowd of persons who destroyed his provisions, that the police who came to the rescue were attacked with sticks and stones, and a head constable seriously wounded; and what steps are being taken to restore order and respect for the Law in this district.

MR. BRYCE: The case referred to appears to be that of Thomas Brady, estate bailiff, who acts as caretaker of three farms from which evictions recently took place. Brady is not himself the tenant of an evicted farm. The occurrence of July 7th is the subject of a pending prosecution against several persons, and it would be undesirable to make a statement upon it while those proceedings are *sub judice*. The head constable was assaulted, but it is not the case that he was seriously wounded. The local police force has been strengthened, and the necessary steps are being taken for the preservation of the peace.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Loans.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received copies of resolutions from the Limerick and Glin district councils showing the reasons why the financial provisions of the Labourers (Ireland) Bill ought to be made retrospective as regards the repayment of outstanding loans borrowed for the purposes of the Acts; and, if so, will he say whether it is the intention of the Government to have them made retrospective.

MR. BRYCE: Resolutions to the effect stated have been received. The intentions of the Government will be stated when the Bill reaches the Report stage.

Kilmallock Council's Expenses for Labourers Cottages Scheme.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the expenses charged to the rural district council of Kilmallock, in the county of Limerick, by the Local Government Board, in connection with their application for a Provisional Order, made in November 1905, in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, amounted to £101 10s. 6d.; and, if so, in what way were these expenses incurred by the Board; and whether, in the event of the Labourers (Ireland) Bill becoming law, the scale of expenses of the inspector and Local Government Board in the making of Provisional Orders will be reduced.

MR. BRYCE: The expenses of this inquiry, amounting to £101 10s. 6d., were made up as follows: Advertising the inquiry, £7 10s. 0d.; shorthand writing. £78 13s. 9d.; law costs for preparation of of order, £10 10s. 9d; publication of order, £4 16s. 0d. One of the objects of the Bill at present before Parliament is to cheapen the procedure under the Labourers Acts, but it is to be noted that the Board do not charge the local authorities with the salary or expenses of the inspectors, or with the expenses of the Board except the actual legal, reporting, and advertising expenses.

Arbitrations under the Labourers Acts.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether in the event of the Labourers (Ireland) Bill becoming Law the arbitrator appointed in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Acts will be paid a fixed salary or by the job; and, if in the latter case, whether his fees will be fixed.

MR. BRYCE: The appointment and remuneration of arbitrators will be fully considered by the Local Government Board when framing the general rules for carrying the Labourers Acts into effect, as provided by Clause 25 of the Bill at present before Parliament. It would at present be premature to make a statement in the matter. Every effort will be made to get the work done as cheaply as possible consistent with efficiency.

Complaint against an Assistant Land Commissioner.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say what has been the result of the inquiries of the Land Commission into the matter of Mr. Lionel Croasdale, a Commissioner whose term of office has expired, and now valuing land for the landlords, sending an official postcard of the Land Commission to a Mr. Richard Sheehy, a tenant in the county of Limerick, who was going into court to have a fair rent fixed, and notifying him that he was to inspect the holding and asking him to meet him, and which led Mr. Sheehy into the belief that he was still a Commissioner; and whether the Land Commission approve of Mr. Croasdale's conduct in the matter?

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Land Commission that Mr. Croasdale, late assistant Commissioner, admits that, after his term of office had expired, he used an official form of postcard notifying his intention of inspecting the holding referred to. Mr. Croasdale points out that his postcard indicated that his inspection was to be on behalf of the landlord, and that before he visited the holding he explained to the tenant the capacity in which he stood. The Commissioners, however consider, that Mr.

Croasdale's use of the postcard was unwarranted.

Labourers Acts Inquiries.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will insert a clause in the Labourers (Ireland) Bill providing that the inspector of the Local Government Board when holding a local inquiry in connection with the Labourers Acts, shall not require the attendance of the medical officers of health in the different unions in Ireland, when they are obliged to give evidence in connection with schemes under these Acts at local inquiries, beyond the first day of the inquiry, with a view of saving expense to the ratepayers.

MR. BRYCE: In the opinion of the Local Government Board the suggestion contained in the Question would only be practicable in the case of small schemes, the inquiries into which will last but a couple of days or so. In the case of large schemes, it has been found necessary to arrange beforehand the days on which the cases in certain specified electoral divisions will be heard at the inquiry, so that the solicitors, medical officers, and witnesses may know definitely when their attendance will be required; and this system seems to have generally met the convenience of all parties. But if an inquiry is to last a week or ten days the giving of all the medical evidence on the opening day would necessitate the attendance on that day of all witnesses wishing to challenge doctor's reports, and of all solicitors intending to cross-examine medical officers. The suggestion, therefore, while perhaps effecting a trifling economy in one direction, would increase expense in other directions and tend to introduce confusion into the inquiry. Where the council are desirous of an inquiry being arranged with a certain order of procedure, an inspector is always prepared to give due weight to any representations made to him in the matter.

Extern Teachers.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any, and, if so, what action has been taken by the Commissioners of National Education with a view to recognising the employment of extern teachers, and the necessity, in making new appointments of teachers in Irish-speaking districts, of requiring such teachers to have an oral knowledge of Irish.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Commissioners of National Education that they have adopted the following rules:—"Qualified extern teachers may be recognised in national schools with the approval of the Commissioners to give instruction in certain subjects of the programme in which the ordinary teachers are not qualified." "In the case of new appointments to schools in Irish-speaking districts, the teachers are required to have an oral knowledge of Irish."

Kilkeasy Lands, Kilkenny.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish Land Commission are landlords of certain lands of Kilkeasy, in the county of Kilkenny, held by fifteen tenants; that up to 1893 these lands were held from the Irish Land Commission by middlemen; that in consequence of the non-payment of rent by these middlemen they were ejected by the Land Commission in 1893; that a representative of the Land Commission then induced some of the occupying tenants to sign agreements to become tenants to the Land Commission at a rent which was nearly three times the rent previously payable to the Land Commission by the middlemen; that these tenants got an undertaking from the representative of the Irish Land Commission, before signing such agreements, that the Land Commission would sell to them under the Land Purchase Acts at 16½ years' purchase of the rent so agreed on, and that the purchase agreements would be sent to them for signature; and will he say why this arrangement has not hitherto been carried out, and whether the Land Commission will now have effect given to it.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Land Commission that the lands referred to consist of Church Temporalities property, of which they are the owners. The middlemen's interest in these lands was determined in the year 1898 by an ejectment for non-payment of rent. On that occasion the occupying tenants were not dispossessed; but they attorned, in accordance with the statute, and became tenants to the Land Commission at the rents at which they then held their holdings, most of which were judicial rents. The Land Commission have no record that any such undertaking as is referred to in the Question was given.

Mr. O'MARA: But the tenants have a record.

Mr. BRYCE: Then let them bring the facts before the Land Commission.

Mr. O'MARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman take care they are not evicted before they have an opportunity of doing so?

Mr. BRYCE: I apprehend there will be no difficulty raised about that.

Cork Evicted Tenants.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners have appointed up to the present only one inspector for duty in the county of Cork; and whether, in view of the size of that county, its large agricultural population, and the considerable number of evicted farms and of estates containing untenanted grass land, the Commissioners are prepared to arrange for the appointment of a sufficient number of inspectors to deal with the large amount of business to be dealt with under the Act of 1903.

Mr. BRYCE: As I have stated in reply to previous Questions, the number of assistant inspectors specially appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the cases of evicted tenants is six. The Estates Commissioners inform me that one of these assistant inspectors has been assigned to county Cork. The Commissioners make the best use of the staff at their disposal, but obviously, it will take some time to inquire into the cases of all evicted tenants who have sent in applications. The Commissioners will arrange for the inspection, by their ordinary staff of inspectors, of all untenanted land offered for sale to them.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at the present rate of progress it will take half a century to reinstate all the tenants, of whom there are 487 in the county of Cork?

Mr. BRYCE: I hope that will not be the case. I am told they are now progressing much more rapidly.

Mr. KILBRIDE: Is not the delay largely due to the unwillingness of the landlords to co-operate with the Estates Commissioners?

Mr. BRYCE: That is undoubtedly so in some cases, but it must not be taken to be universal.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that although there are over 300 evicted tenants in county Limerick no inspector has been sent there?

Mr. BRYCE: The inspector is finishing his work in county Clare, and I hope he will soon be able to pass into Limerick.

Congestion—The Commission of Inquiry.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the terms of reference of the Commission appointed to inquire into congestion, he will expand the terms so as to expressly include all uneconomic agricultural holdings and all untenanted land; will he arrange that those responsible for the present inflation of prices shall not have a majority on the Commission; and will the Commission be required to report within the present year; and if not, will he persist in setting up the Commission.

Mr. BRYCE: Such an expansion of the terms of reference as is suggested in the Question would so greatly enlarge the scope of the Commission as to involve a great prolongation of its labours. The question of untenanted land will, however, be fully considered in its relations to the problem of congestion. I do not know who are intended in the Question as the persons responsible for the present inflation of prices. The Commission will, it is hoped, report at the earliest date at which it can do so consistently with the proper consideration of the matters referred to it.

MR. GINNELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a large number of people are bitterly disappointed with the terms of reference?

MR. BRYCE: No, Sir. On the contrary, I think the Commission has given every satisfaction in Ireland.

MR. GINNELL: To emphasise its character will the right hon. Gentleman add Lord Dunraven and Lord Clanricarde?

AN HON. MEMBER: And Ginnell too.

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Poor Law Medical Service.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board for Ireland has recently issued a special order requiring that every medical practitioner qualified after the 1st May, 1906, who may seek any appointment, either temporary or permanent, in the Poor Law medical service shall produce a special certificate of proficiency in vaccination, which must be obtained from three selected medical men in the whole of Ireland, one each in Dublin, Cork, and Belfast; whether, seeing that the different universities and licensing corporations accept as sufficient certificates of instruction in vaccination granted to medical students by the public vaccinators in Dublin, Cork, Galway and Belfast, and that neither of the doctors selected in Cork and Belfast is a public vaccinator, will he explain why the certificates of instruction in vaccination, issued by dispensing medical officers (who are the responsible public vaccinators in Ireland), are not sufficient for the requirements of the Local Government Board; and whether he will cause the new order to be withdrawn or so modified as to allow of the certificates of public vaccinators being accepted in future.

MR. BRYCE: The Answer to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. The object of the Local Government Board in issuing the order referred to was to ensure that young medical men who enter the Poor Law service should first receive such thorough instruction in the important subject of vaccination as would fit them for the responsible duties of public vaccinators. The Board consider that this end can best be attained by the selection of one competent instructor in each of the teaching centres. A medical practitioner cannot be sanctioned as a public vaccinator in Great Britain unless he possesses a certificate of proficiency in vaccination from an authorised teacher; and, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, the interests of the public demand that a like qualification should be prescribed for Ireland. The responsibility for making suitable regulations in the matter is vested by Statute in the Local Government Board, who do not see any reason for withdrawing or modifying their order.

Shimla River Salmon Fishery.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Board of Conservators has been drawn to the fact that the Earl of Annesley, through his bailiff, is in the habit of fishing for salmon within the half-mile limit at Shimla River, Newcastle, county Down, whilst fishermen who pay the same license duty are prohibited from doing so; and whether steps will be taken to have the half-mile limit marked, and to have the regulations enforced irrespective of persons.

MR. BRYCE: The use of all nets for the capture of salmon within half-a-mile of the defined mouth of any Irish river is illegal, save by the owner of a several fishery therein. The Department of Agriculture understand that the Earl of Annesley claims a several fishery within half-a-mile of the defined mouth of the Shimla River. Prosecutions are now being taken by the local Board of Conservators against some members of the public for fishing within this half-mile. The Department will take steps to ascertain whether this half-mile limit can be satisfactorily marked.

MR. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman support the Board of Conservators against the Earl of Annesley?

MR. BRYCE: I do not know that I have any power over the Board.

Irish Finance.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury in reference to Return 190, County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act, 1877, whether he can state if the entire sum of £24,815 is paid directly to the Treasury; whether the net amount received by the Inland Revenue Department in respect of fee stamps, £21,105, is credited to the Irish account in the Annual Return as to receipts, expenditure, and contribution to revenue; and what is the explanation of the fact that the amount paid by the Treasury, under Section 25 of the Act, is returned as nil.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The total sum of £24,815 2s. 3d. shown in the Return was made up of a sum of £21,105 14s. 8d., which was received by the Inland Revenue and paid over to the Exchequer as part of the Miscellaneous Revenue, and of sums amounting together to £3,709 7s. 7d., which were appropriated in aid of the County Court Officers (Ireland) Vote, thereby reducing the issues required from the Exchequer for the service of that Vote. The net amount received by the Inland Revenue will in ordinary course be included under the head of Revenue derived from Ireland in the Financial Relations Return for 1905–6. The reason for the *nil* return under Section 25 of the Act is that no pension is being paid under that section.

Australian Commonwealth and the Navy.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the opinion of the Australian Commonwealth strongly favours the creation of a local Navy in addition to a contribution to the Imperial fleet; and whether in deference to this view, the Imperial Committee of Defence will reconsider the the scheme of Australian defence, which they have drawn up, with a view to making provision for an Australian local torpedo flotilla.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am aware that a section of opinion in Australia is in favour of the establishment of a local Naval force; but there is no reason to believe that this is the opinion of the majority of Australians. The decision as to whether a local Navy shall be initiated must rest with the Government of the Commonwealth. Up to the present time the Committee of Imperial Defence have only been asked by the Government of the Commonwealth to express its own views as to Australian defence, and those views have been forwarded to the Governor-General.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked whether it was not within the competence of the Australian Commonwealth to establish a local fleet, and that there was no power in the Imperial Parliament to prevent it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As to the legal and the constitutional question, I do not know that I could give a sweeping answer. But practically that is so. I may add that, if the Commonwealth decide to have a local force, I should hope that they would take our advice as to the constitution of the force; but it would be friendly advice.

Royal Commissions.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury how many Royal Commissions have been announced by the Government, and how many have been appointed.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Royal Commissions issued since 10th December, 1905, are as follows:—Canals and Waterways; Horse-breeding (the old Commission was re-issued on 24th March); Metropolitan Police Duties; Health and Safety of Miners; Church of England in Wales and Monmouthshire; Coast Erosion; Trinity College, Dublin; Operation of the Acts dealing with Congestion in Ireland (about to issue). The Worcester Bribery Commission will also, I believe, shortly be issued. The inquiries by Royal Commission which we contemplate in addition to those enumerated include the question of Vivisection, the Lighting of our Coasts, and Shipping Rebates.

Vote for Imperial Defence.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when an opportunity will be given for discussing the Vote for the Committee of Imperial Defence.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid the only opportunity will be on the Appropriation Bill.

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I wish to ask if it is in order for Questions supplementary to Questions put to one Minister to be addressed to another Minister?

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes, if they are relevant to the first Question asked I see no reason why they should not be so put.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Charles Devlin; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Nolan.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Leave to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 270.]

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday July 30th, and to be printed. [Bill 316.]

NEW BILL.

POST OFFICE (LITERATURE FOR THE BLIND) BILL.

"To facilitate the transmission by post of books and papers impressed for the use of the blind," presented by Mr. Sydney Buxton; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 315.]

EDUCATION ENGLAND AND WALES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 38:—

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) moved to insert in line 32, page 21, after "schools" the words "and to the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich," this school having been accidently omitted from the clause.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, after the word 'schools' to insert the words 'and to the Royal Hospital School, Greenwich.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said there were six such schools, and he did not see why if one was to receive special treatment the other five should not also be similarly treated.

MR. BIRRELL said he was told that the Royal Hospital School stood in a different position from the others and, therefore, was the only one which need be inserted.

Question put, and agreed to.

*MR. ACLAND (Yorkshire, Richmond) moved an Amendment to the effect that schools for demonstration and practice connected with training colleges inspected by the Board of Education should be included amongst those schools in receipt of Parliamentary grant. He said that these schools, which he wished to receive special treatment were schools of a special nature and corresponded to the laboratory and dissecting rooms for the training of doctors. They were schools in which teachers were trained before they were competent to go out into the schools under the local authorities, and were institutions for practising the art of teaching. They were usually very small schools and the classes rarely exceeded in composition ten or twenty children. These classes were often attended by a particular kind of child, viz., those difficult to instruct or who were slightly defective in some way and whose parent preferred to send them there rather than to the larger schools of the ordinary elementary character. It was necessary for the efficient organisation of these schools that they should be subject to special regulations—first, because experiments were made in connection with methods and apparatus, secondly, because it was essential that the classes should be smaller than those of the ordinary elementary school, and thirdly, because they had to be partly staffed by the special staff of the training college. It was necessary that entire freedom should be given to the master of method in the training college in selecting an efficient staff to act as teachers in these particular schools. Indeed, special treatment was necessary in order that the schools should exist at all. Efficient training could not be given unless the school were an integral part of the training college. The difficulty of getting these schools started at all would be considerably removed if special regulations were granted to them. Local authorities, if the schools were under them, would be quite within their rights if they required that these schools should be as big and staffed in the same way as other schools, but if that were done their usefulness would be lost. He sincerely hoped that there would be no opposition to his Amendment from the other side of the House, for he was assured that a similar proposal was left out of the Bill of 1902 by inadvertence. From the point of view of Ministerialists he was sure they might all be perfectly clear that such provisions as might be made would not lead to any abuses. He thought they might safely leave the regulations in connection with these schools to the Board of Education, because the officials of the Board would see that there were efficient guarantees for the conscience clause, the supervision and publication of accounts, and other essential matters. The schools would probably need high grants, and the Treasury would see they did not get beyond a certain size.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, after the word 'schools' to insert the words 'to schools for demonstration and practice connected with training colleges inspected by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Acland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord BALCARRES thought the schools were admirable institutions and the education given in them was better in many ways than that given in the ordinary elementary schools. He would like to know, however, whether the insertion of the words would affect the existing *status* of the schools.

Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he could not think that the President of the Board of Education had considered whether these new schools would be put in the same position as the State-aided schools.

Mr. BIRRELL said it was not intended in any way to alter their present position.

Sir HENRY CRAIK said that under Section 10 a grant was paid to the local authority in respect of attendance at a particular school. In the case of the new State-aided schools it was expressly provided that they should get this grant, and he wished to know if it was intended that these new schools should share the grant which was to be paid to the local authority.

Mr. BIRRELL said the hon. Member was an expert in these matters, but he could not quite could not quite follow his argument. He could assure him, however, that nothing was intended to prevent these schools getting whatever grants they were now receiving.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said that he was afraid that under this clause a stop might be put to the boarding-out system. This system was mostly carried out in rural areas. He knew a village school in Gloucestershire with fifty children on the roll, twenty of whom were boarded-out children. Unless some indication was given by the Minister for Education that he was willing to work hand and glove with the Local Government Board in regard to the boarding-out system adopted by boards of guardians he was afraid that that beneficial system might be injured, and possibly collapse altogether. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, after the word 'schools,' to insert the words 'to any certified efficient school provided that one-half of the scholars attending the school are children boarded out under the regulations of the Local Government Board.'"—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said this case was already properly provided for and any elementary school of this kind could get the grant without State aid. It was proposed to do that, and he had accepted an Amendment lower down on the Paper to omit the words "with the consent of the Local Education Authority." He did not think they could extend the clause beyond that, nor did he think it was necessary. It would be difficult to estimate how many schools would be brought in under the clause. They had no information in regard to them, because they did not come within the usual statistics.

MR. BOLAND said that what he referred to were boarded-out children sent from the various unions into the country districts and lodged with foster mothers. If something was not done in the direction he had indicated, the whole system of boarded-out children might collapse, and the people interested in the system would not care to carry it on. He hoped the right hon Gentleman would see if the difficulty he had raised could not be met upon the Report stage.

MR. BIRRELL said they were now dealing with the ordinary kind of school. There might be an orphanage or a board of guardians might send children to the school, but he did not think they ought to extend the clause to meet cases of that kind. They were now dealing with a special kind of school, and not a special kind of child. He did not think there ought to be any differentiation in this matter, but he would undertake to give it his careful attention, and if anything ought to be done he would do it. He did not think, however, that they should alter the character of the school and take it out of its proper category as an ordinary elementary school simply because a certain number of the children attending that school happened to sleep under the same charitable roof in the neighbourhood.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said this proposal was a modification of the clause in the Act of 1902 which was intended to prevent a large number of children being brought in and dumped down upon a locality. It dealt with orphanages and convent schools where a number of children were educated under one roof. Now his hon. friend wanted the same protection applied to districts where there were boarded-out children. He thought in such cases the local authorities might be assisted with Parliamentary grants.

MR. BIRRELL said he would give the point his attention.

MR. BOLAND asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HEDGES (Kent, Tonbridge) said he would move formally the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, to leave out the words 'with the consent of the local education authority."—(*Mr. Hedges.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

LORD BALCARRES, in moving the omission of the words of the clause after "marine schools," said that this was a question of considerable importance to Lancashire, where there were a large number of schools managed entirely by religious communities, which were essentially conventual establishments in which elementary education was given. He wished to know what was going to be the relation of the local education authorities to these conventual schools. The point which concerned them most was not the elementary education as such, because many of them were recognised as public elementary schools. What was a matter of greater interest to them was how far these schoolhouses, which were part and parcel of the actual conventual buildings and establishments, would be in future under the control of the local education authority. Point was given to this question by a very singular new clause which appeared on the Paper this morning, giving to the local education authorities a right to claim the use of the schoolhouse on three days a week, a clause which might be a very serious matter to the owners and trustees of these conventual schools. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give some reassuring statement that the position of this particular group of schools would not be seriously imperilled by this proposal. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 32, to leave out from the word 'and' to the end of the clause."—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said the education authorities would acquire the right to use the school outside school hours only for the purpose of evening classes. Under this new Bill it would be impossible to impose the legal obligation upon those schoolhouses to allow these evening classes except as a matter of fresh bargain and agreement. Everybody was agreed that it was a most desirable thing that where an agreement was made between the parties the evening continuation classes should be continued as heretofore on the school premises. The object of the new clause was to enable that to be done.

LORD BALCARRES asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Clause 38, as amended, stand part of the Bill."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he wished to say a word with regard to the Amendment, moved by the hon. Member for the Richmond Division, and accepted by the Government, providing for the payment of a Parliamentary grant—

"To schools for demonstration and practice connected with training colleges inspected by the Board of Education."

That was a matter which would require careful watching, It was a proposal to take these schools right out of the hands of the local authorities. In many cases the fabrics of the schools were very bad indeed and ill-adapted to the purpose for which they were used. He urged that it would be necessary for the Board of Education to make careful regulations with regard to the grant and the future conduct of the schools. The cost per child would be heavier than in the ordinary schools if they were to be conducted at all properly.

MR. BIRRELL said he was quite alive to the point raised by his hon. friend.

*SIR W. ANSON said that many different types of schools had grown up in the progress of the Bill, and one of these received nothing but the Parliamentary grant and would be outside the control of the local education authority.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 39 :—

MR. BIRRELL moved to insert the words "or withheld" after the word "made." He explained that the clause conferred powers on the Board of Education to dispose of questions outstanding under Section 13 of the Education Act of 1902 as to the application of any endowment. The clause, if this Amendment were agreed to, would provide that the Board, on the application of the local education authority, or any persons appearing to them to be interested, "may indemnify any person in respect of any payment purporting to have been made or withheld in pursuance of that section, notwithstanding that the payment has not been properly made." Questions had arisen between a great number of local authorities and the Board of Education as to the very small control that they had been able to obtain for their education purposes over the endowments within their areas. Clause 13 of the Act of 1902 was useful and admirable, but it had not dealt with the proportion of the income which should be paid to the local education authority. Some of the trusts were for charitable and educational purposes, and questions had arisen as to how much of the money should go to the maintenance of education in the area and how much of it was applicable to other purposes. This clause would enable the Board of Education to determine the proportions. It was an administrative question, and he was sure that the hon. Member for Oxford University would admit that the Board should have the power of determining what share of the income should be paid for education. Complaints had been made in London of what the education authority believed to be the ludicrously small sum received. It was something so ludicrously small as to be practically negligible. The education authority thought that more powers would enable them to get more money.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 10, after the word 'made' to insert the words 'or withheld.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he understood this clause was simply to enable the Board of Education to clear up outstanding questions. If that was so, what was the necessity for the new power proposed to be given to the Board of Education? Did it mean that the Board would have power to re-open the accounts from 1902 to 1905 and order the payment of what they thought to be arrears? That would be a very drastic proceeding, and he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman did not intend that legislation should take that form.

MR. BIRRELL said there were a number of outstanding cases between the managers of schools and the local authorities which ought to be settled, and the object of the clause was really to enable the Board to wind-up those questions without the chance of litigation. In order to do that it was desirable that the Act of 1902 should be amended in this particular, so that they might be able to strike the balance and get rid of the whole affair in the interest of peace.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said this was a very far-reaching clause, and a very vague one. He was familiar with a concrete case where the arrangements between those who had the expenditure of the income of the endowments and the local authority were very well understood. They had been acted upon in the case of London schools since 1903. It seemed to him that this clause gave the local authority power to come in and demand what it liked of the income of the foundation. He really thought the Committee ought to have some clearer definition of what the powers of the local authority in this respect were. Could they be exercised in the way of disturbing arrangements which had already been settled and acted upon in regard to these schools for years?

MR. BIRRELL said that this clause did not deal in any way with the subject brought forward by the hon. Gentleman.

Question put, and agreed to.

Question, "That Clause 39, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put and agreed to.

Clause 40:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 17, to leave out from the word 'enactment' to end of Sub-section (1)."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Question, "That Clause 40, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

MR. BIRRELL said that the new clause he now proposed stood in a somewhat peculiar and unusual position. The Bill as introduced did not impose any obligation upon the local education authority to take over any existing voluntary school, and therefore the facilities under Clause 3 were clearly dependent upon the willingness of the local education authority to take over the schools. The Government had originally no intention of imposing any obligation upon the local education authority to provide themselves with the existing voluntary schools. But they were to have power, if they chose to do so, to enter into negotiations under Clause 2 for the purpose of acquiring the use of the school premises during school hours, and if they did that, Clause 3 secured, if the trustees of the schools insisted upon it, that on two days a week special facilities should be given for denominational instruction. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University pointed out that there was a gap, and proposed an Amendment, the effect of which was that, assuming the schools were structurally fit, there should be an obligation upon the part of the local education authority to take over the schools. That was a unilateral obligation, and he undertook to consider whether an arrangement could be come to whereby the local education authority would be bound to take over existing voluntary schools if the owners or trustees wished them to do so; and the private owners and trustees would be under an obligation to transfer their schools to the local education authority if the local education authority wished to take them. That had been called a bilateral obligation. He realised that it would have certain advantages. It would get rid of a considerable number of private owners who were under no obligation to part with their schools, and it would get rid of difficult legal questions relating to the trust deeds, and the only duty of the Commissioners would be to consider what terms would be fair to impose upon the parties. The Government made that proposal; but this was not a clause he could use the power of the Government to impose upon hon. Gentlemen opposite. It was contrary to the scheme contained in the Bill. It imposed on private owners of schools, who were more numerous than was generally supposed, a stern obligation to part with their property—of course, on terms; and it also got rid of the question whether the trustees could be said to be carrying out their trusts properly by transferring their schools to the local education authority. Therefore this was not a clause which he could impose by force upon hon. Gentlemen opposite. He asked them whether it was a clause which commended itself to their minds. It had advantages, but he did not think it was particularly popular with his hon. friends behind him. The reception which the proposal met with at the hands of the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Waterford would have justified him in not proceeding with the matter, but he indicated his willingness to consider it. The proposal amply carried out the pledge, promise, or undertaking, which he had given. There was one outstanding point of importance to which he must allude. It was agreed on both sides that the schools should be suitable, and that the local education authority should not be compelled to take over a school which was not suitable, or to take over schools in cases where there was a numerical redundancy. In the case of these Clause 4 schools, a great many of them were numerically redundant, having had their origin not in the fact that the school accommodation was deficient in the neighbourhood, but in the desire of parents to secure denominational education for their children. If they were to deal simply with that kind of school and say they would not allow it to exist unless it could be shown that it was absolutely necessary to provide suitable accommodation in the neighbourhood they would be ruling a large number of them out of court. Consequently when they came to deal under Clause 4 with schools of that character they had provided an appeal to the Board of Education, and the terms of that appeal did not necessitate that the school should not be numerically redundant. He had that in his mind. With regard to the ordinary village schools in the country, for the most part they were not numerically redundant, but were required to provide suitable accommodation for the children. He thought it would be most unreasonable to impose upon the local authority a general obligation to take over all these schools whether they were wanted or not, but the majority of them in the country districts were wanted because they were not numerically redundant. Therefore it seemed to him only reasonable and right that, before the obligation was imposed upon a local authority to take over a school which was not required for school accommodation, there should be an appeal to the Board of Education, in the same way as the owners had an appeal if the authority refused to take a school over.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) inquired if this clause applied to all the voluntary schools or only to those schools not under Clause 4. He was not quite sure whether he understood the right hon. Gentleman aright upon that point.

MR. BIRRELL replied that it applied to all schools, but, in the case of the Clause 4 schools, they had provided for an appeal to the Board of Education in regard to facilities. He had only touched upon the question because he wished to make it plain to the Committee that this question of numerical redundancy applied to one kind of school and did not have any effect upon the others. There was the clause. He could not promise that it would receive any Amendment, because it was the farthest point to which the Government could go in this matter. If adopted, it would necessitate considerable alteration in the Bill and in the character of the work of the Commission. Although it might shorten their labours in some respects, in other respects it might not be so satisfactory. He would like to know the attitude of mind of hon. Members opposite with regard to the clause, because it was not one which he could force upon the Committee. If hon. Members did not like, or did not accept, the clause it must be omitted, and the only course for him to adopt in the event of its not being accepted would be on the Question being put that the clause be read a Second Time to say "No." He thought that he had got the Committee into a little bit of a tangle over this matter owing to his lack of experience, and perhaps he would not have gone so far but for that fact, but at all events there was the clause. He saw advantages in it, but whatever its advantages might be he could not use the Government majority to force it upon the House. He begged to move.

New Clause—

"(1) If the local education authority refuse to agree to any arrangement offered to them as respects the use of a schoolhouse by the owners thereof or if the owners of a schoolhouse refuse to agree to any arrangement as respects the use of the schoolhouse offered to them by the local education authority, the owners of the schoolhouse or the local education authority, as the case may be, may appeal to the Board of Education, and that Board may, if they consider that the school is required for the purpose of providing sufficient public school accommodation, and that the schoolhouse is structurally suitable, and that there are no other reasonable grounds for refusal, by order make an arrangement under this section with respect to the use of the schoolhouse on such terms as may be contained in the order, and any order so made shall have effect as if it was an arrangement made under this Act between the parties. Provided that (a) No arrangement so made by order of the Board of Education shall have effect for more than five years; and (b) A guarantee by the owners of a schoolhouse themselves effectively to continue the school as a certified efficient school for a period of at least five years shall be treated as a reasonable ground for their refusal to agree to an arrangement with the local education authority. (2) Where an appeal under this section is made in respect of a schoolhouse subject to charitable trusts, and the Board of Education make an order on the appeal, the Board, in fixing the payment (if any) to be made by the local education authority for the use of the schoolhouse shall have regard to the extent to which effect is given to those trusts by the arrangement. (3) It shall be the duty of the local education authority and the owners of the schoolhouse respectively to comply with any terms contained in an arrangement made by an order of the Board of Education under this section. (4) The right of appeal given by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any right of appeal given by this Act as regards the schoolhouse of a school in respect of which extended facilities are desired."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this clause be now read a Second Time.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said he had an Amendment on the Paper to make the clause unilateral instead of bilateral by leaving out the words which gave the local authority the power of appeal. When the Committee were discussing Clause 3 it was suggested that, if Parliament chose to alter the educational system by abolishing all voluntary schools, and substituting for them a system of provided schools only, then Parliament ought to make some provision for those who, under Parliamentary sanction, had erected voluntary schools, and ought to give them a chance of saying that they wished to be taken over by the local education authority. The right hon. Gentleman assented to that, but said that if there was a right of appeal in one case it must be given on the other side also. The point he wanted to make was that while it was right to give a right of appeal to the owners of the voluntary schools, it by no means followed that a similar right should be given to the education authority. It was one thing to say that those who had done good work under the old system should be entitled to protection if they asked for it, and it was another thing to say that the old owners of a school should be subjected to compulsion by the local authority. The fact that there had been Parliamentary grants to a school was no argument in favour of compelling the owner to hand over his school. The grants and the rates were not given to the owners but to the children, and he did not think it should be put upon the owner that because grants had been made for the benefit of the children for whom he also had been working, therefore he should be made to hand over his property against his will. Further, as the Bill stood, the authority would have two pistols, which they could present, so to speak, at the head of the owners, namely Clause 8 and the clause now under discussion, while the owners would have one pistol only, namely, this clause. He did not think that was a fair position in which to place the owners of private schools. It was said that the local authority ought not to be put in a difficulty by the sudden closing of the schools, but that was provided for by the Bill as it stood, under Clause 11, by which the owner of the school was bound to keep it open whether he wished or not, down to the end of the year 1908. For these reasons, while he was desirous that the clause now proposed should be read a second time, he should feel bound later on to move the Amendments he had on the Paper.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that as the right hon. Gentleman could not now defend the clause which he had moved, some of those who were in favour of it might defend it for themselves. He had never understood that the opinion of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite had anything to do with whether the Government moved this clause or not. That was not the arrangement which he understood was come to when he moved an Amendment on a previous occasion. The proposal came from the Ministerial side of the House, and the right hon. Gentleman made a most courteous reply on the following day which tended to shew that the acceptance or rejection of this clause did not depend on anything said by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. He did not wish to make any point as to when the bargain was struck; he merely pointed it out to the right hon. Gentleman opposite to shew that they really had reason to suggest that it was a question not of his opinion, but of the opinion of those who moved from the Ministerial side of the House. His right hon. friend would therefore, he thought, be well advised to move his clause and support it, and to take a divison upon it with the full force of the Government behind him. He was well aware that a new situation had arisen owing to the concession made on Clause 4 with regard to the four-fifths schools to which a right of appeal was given. There must, however, be many schools on the border line, and those schools were not helped by that concession. But they were helped by the proposals of the new clause. Let them suppose for a moment that there was a pig-headed local authority, and a school of 500 children, the parents of 399 of whom desired a particular form of teaching, and the owners also desired a particular form of teaching. As the Bill stood the local authority could disregard the wishes of the parents of the 399 children, and of the owners, and leave the school derelict. It was to obviate such a thing as that that the right hon. Gentleman moved the new clause. It was a far more democratic proposal than the original proposal in Clause 8. The whole of the trouble that had arisen since the Act of 1902 had been caused by their leaving it to the dead hand to decide what education should be given to the children of a particular locality. They trusted the trusts instead of the parents. He had pointed out that there was this gap in the Bill, and if the clause of the right hon. Gentleman was inserted the whole difficulty would be swept away. This was a very democratic proposal and it contained the germ of the only possible solution of the matter. It was not a concession to the owners of the schools; it was the direct opposite and had the opposite effect. It was quite true that there came the difficulty of the private owners of schools. He thought in the case of those schools it would be unwise to enforce a provision which placed a bi-lateral responsibility on the owners. It was a strong thing to step in and seize a man's private property in which there was no educational trust. Of course it must be admitted that if this clause was accepted the whole shape of the Bill would be altered, but it would be altered for the better; it would be altered in the direction of consulting the parents in the locality, and it was in that spirit he supported it, and recommended it to the Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill that the Committee was now in a very peculiar position. The right hon. Gentleman had attempted to thrust on the Opposition, and, he imagined, on the Leader of the Opposition in particular, a responsibility which did not fit in with their position. He repudiated the responsibility with which the right hon. Gentleman desired to endow him. It was for the right hon. Gentleman, and him alone, to decide what he would ask the Committee to accept. So far as he was concerned, though he did not admire the clause and thought that it did not really come up to the legitimate expectations which the right hon. Gentleman had held out to them, it might well be that in the further discussion Amendments might be introduced which might make it an improvement on the Bill. Of that, however, it was impossible for him to make any forecast. But if the right hon. Gentleman was of opinion that by this clause he had fulfilled the legitimate expectations formed, not only by the Opposition in the House, but throughout the country, based on the statements of himself and his colleagues, he must allow him to correct that impression. He made no charge of bad faith against the right hon. Gentleman. He was not in the habit of making charges of bad faith against anyone in the House, and the right hon. Gentleman was the last man against whom he would ever think of making such a charge. But the right hon. Gentleman must forgive him if he said that he thought that in his own statement and the statements of his colleagues there was something more than a verbal inaccuracy, which he said was due to his own want of Parliamentary experience. He had not noticed any want of Parliamentary experience on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. But whether that praise was deserved or not—he thought it was thoroughly deserved—the right hon. Gentleman must allow him to say that no mere verbal slip accounted for the impression that had been given. The impression given to the House and the country was that though voluntary schools were to be handed over to the local authority so far as elementary education was concerned, the interests of denominational teaching would be preserved, because in those schools there would be two days of the week on which denominational teaching would be given. Though that was inadequate, still it was felt that in every voluntary school some provision would be made to carry on denominational teaching. But it appeared from the Bill that it was only in those schools which the local authorities chose to take over that those facilities would be granted, and that the local authority had an absolute right to refuse to take over any schools. The position, therefore, was that under the Bill it would be possible for the local authorities all over the country to refuse to take over any voluntary school, and that henceforth the only religious teaching in any provided school would be that given under the Cowper-Temple clause. There was no limitation, except that of expense, in the way of substituting a complete system of Cowper-Temple religious instruction for the mixed system now prevailing. What had Ministers themselves said? The Minister for Education, in introducing the Bill, said—

> "Thus far the facilities or opportunities I have spoken of have been of a compulsory character. When demanded and when required the authorities must grant them."

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said—

> "On two days of the week the education authority is obliged to hand over to the denomination the religious teaching in the schools. That is what the Bill proposes. There are two days upon which the Church or denomination for whom the school was erected are entitled to carry out this religious teaching. It is not optional; it is not subject to the local authorities. They will be entitled if the Act passes and the parent wishes his child to be so taught, to give religious teaching."

Again the Minister in charge of the Bill said—

> "Clause 3, until it was explained by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his lucid and admirable speech, seems not to have been understood by Gentlemen opposite. I think they must now at all events understand its meaning to be plain, that if the trustees of any school make this particular stipulation for transfer, that there should be those facilities given on two days in the week, obligation to permit that teaching becomes statutory."

He was unable to believe that the Ministers who made those statements had before them clearly and precisely the terms of their own measure. They must for a moment have thought that the Bill intended, whilst making public control universal, to preserve the denominational element in our educational system by allowing denominational teaching on two days of the week out of school hours at the cost of the denomination. That was not the case. The Bill accordingly fell far short of the legitimate expectations of those who had listened to the speeches made from the Government Benches. The President of the Board of Education attempted to meet the situation by a new clause, which from the point of view of this particular controversy had two fundamental defects. In the first place it required the bilateral arrangement. If the object of the Government was, as appeared from this, to require religious facilities to be given in these schools, why was it necessary to have a condition given by the owners of voluntary schools in exchange for that right? Why, above all, because one kind of school or one individual school was to have the right of giving denominational instruction, were they going to impose upon the owners of another and wholly different school the onerous obligation of being handed over to the local authority against the will of the owner or trustees? For his own part he failed to see what was the logical or equitable connection between the privilege of giving denominational instruction on the one side, and the privilege granted to local authorities on the other of commandeering every school in the district if they pleased to do so. Then under the new clause the Board of Education had to take into account two conditions, and unless both conditions were fulfilled, they could not make it obligatory on the local authority to take over the school. The premises must be structurally suitable, and the school must be required for the purpose of providing sufficient public school accommodation. No one had raised any objection to the first of those conditions, but if he understood the effect of this clause in connection with Clause 4 it would destroy the great mass of Clause 4 schools altogether, because the right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that the great majority of those schools were not required numerically to provide the necessary accommodation in their district. Apparently, except in the case of a minority of schools, Clause 4 could be wrecked under the Government scheme by any obstinate local authority. There was an end to Clause 4 schools so far as the great majority of them were concerned. As to the promise made, he agreed with the Member for the Abercromby Division that it was made to Members below the gangway on the Ministerial side of the House. It was not with him that the President of the Board of Education had to reckon; but it was emphatically his opinion that the clause which the right hon. Gentleman had put on the Paper did not carry out the legitimate expectations formed on the statements of the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues. The interests of denominational education in Clause 3 and Clause 4 schools remained, as before, practically at the mercy of a foolish or obstinate local authority.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said the President of the Board of Education had been very honest, candid, frank, and straightforward throughout the whole of this particular matter, and he was bound to say that the Leader of the Opposition had endeavoured to lure his right hon. friend on to a game of "heads I win, tails you lose." He did not use the term offensively. The President of the Board of Education had always said that he intended the facilities under Clauses 3 and 4 to be real and not illusory. The Opposition had pointed out again and again that it might happen that a local authority would refuse to strike a bargain under Clause 2, and, therefore, Clauses 3 and 4 would at once become a delusion and a snare. The Leader of the Opposition said Clause 4 might be spoilt because the local authority would take over only a small proportion of the schools. He was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had not followed the Amendments to the Bill, because sub-section 4 of Clause (4) had been thus amended—

> "Where the local education authority refuse to agree to an arrangement offered to them by the owners of the school-house of an existing voluntary school as respects the use of the school-house, and the school is one in respect of which extended facilities could be granted under this section, and are desired, the owners of the school-house may appeal to the Board of Education, and that Board may, if they think fit, after considering the circumstances of the case, and the wishes of the parents of children attending the school as to the continuance of the school with extended facilities, by order, make an arrangement under this Act with respect to the use of the school-house on such terms and conditions as may be contained in the order."

That absolutely saved the Clause 4 schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was a very interesting and important point, but the hon. Gentleman would remember they never discussed it in this House, and therefore the extraordinary obscurity of Clause 4 remained unillumined. The words he himself relied upon were at the beginning of sub-section (4), namely—

> "An application may be made under this section as respects any existing voluntary school for a permission to take effect in the event of the school becoming a transferred voluntary school."

It was most obscurely worded.

DR. MACNAMARA said that if the right hon. Gentleman read on he would see that his interpretation was also a perfectly intelligible one. If there were any obscurity about the opening sentence he was sure that would be remedied. Sub-section (4) in the spirit and the letter, so far as he read it, was that when the parties sat down together under Clause 2, if the local education authority refused to treat, then the trustees, the parents, and the rest of them, had a right of appeal to the Board of Education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Is not that augmented by the statement made by the Minister for Education just now, in which he said that the new clause dealt both with Clause 3 schools and with Clause 4 schools? If it deals with Clause 3 schools the hon. Member will see that the words I raise objection to are of serious importance.

DR. MACNAMARA: I suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that Clause 4 schools are saved under sub-section (4), and if there is any doubt about the effect of the opening sentences I should say that could be very well made plain, because the substance of the sub-section is to give people the right of appeal to the Board of Education.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Will the hon. Gentleman look at the opening words of Clause 4 which says that a local education authority may afford extended facilities for religious instruction of some special character not permitted under Section 14 of the Act of 1870, in any transferred school in an urban area. The new clause contains conditions precedent to the transfer.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): Under sub-section (4) the

Board of Education may, if they think fit, change the school to a State-aided school.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he should say from all statements he had heard from the Treasury Bench with regard to the intentions of the Board of Education that they would be very loth to be driven for educational reasons to make any school State-aided. He now turned to Clause 3 schools. He admitted they were not safeguarded as Clause 4 schools were. The Leader of the Opposition said: "Away go Clause 3 schools and any form of religious teaching except Cowper-Temple teaching." Might he call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to sub-section (5) of Clause 2? It was under Clause 2 that these people sat down to treat for transfer. He thought the total effect of that was that it should not be a ground for refusal to treat because it might be presumed that the trustees were going to ask for facilities. He thought it carried out the intention of the Minister for Education that they must not refuse to treat. But the President of the Board of Education had gone further, and said in regard to Clause 3 schools, that if a school were structurally fit, and if it were necessary for the school accommodation of the district, he would give an appeal to the Board of Education, and if the Board thought a bargain should be struck, then it would be struck. He agreed that there should be a bi-lateral compulsion. If they said to the local authority that they should do these things, they ought to give the right of appeal to the Board of Education for use of the school if they wanted it. It only extended to Clause 3 schools. There was no compulsion on the trustees of Clause 4 schools. The compulsion was entirely on the local authority, and he must say that if this clause were not now acceptable—and so far as he was concerned it would have to be taken as it stood or not at all—then he thought both sides of the House might join in a sort of bi-lateral compulsion to vote it entirely out of the Bill.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he was asked by his hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford to say that his position remained exactly as it was when this Bill was first discussed. He would first allude to the different interpretations put upon sub-section (4) of the new Clause 4. He gathered from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition that he was of opinion that some of the words did away with the right of appeal of the Clause 4 schools. Another hon. Member had entirely contested that view. He gathered that the Minister for Education accepted the interpretation of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and that this new clause, if passed in its present shape, would by no means damnify the right of appeal. So far as he and his friends were concerned this new clause had no effect on their position. While agreeing with the Leader of the Opposition that the opening words of sub-section (4) appeared to be rather inexplicable, at the same time sub-section (4) of the new clause said that—

> "the right of appeal given by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any right of appeal given by this Act as regards the schoolhouse of a school in respect of which extended facilities are desired."

He understood the obvious intention of that sub-section was that in no circumstances should this clause interfere with the right of appeal in regard to Clause 4 schools. This new clause could not do them any good, and he was not sure it could do them any harm. That being so his hon. friend's acceptance of this new clause was conditional upon Clause 4 leaving them in a satisfactory position. They did not consider that clause in its present shape by any means satisfactory; on the contrary, it imperilled a very large number of their schools, and they hoped that before the measure passed into law the defects of the clause would be remedied. For the moment he admitted that the Minister for Education had pledged himself that the right of appeal under Clause 4 was secured, and he assumed that if any words were necessary to elucidate the matter the right hon. Gentleman would introduce them on Report. Therefore, their attitude with regard to this clause was that they were indifferent, and, if anything, hostile.

The CHANCELLOR of the DUCHY of LANCASTER (Sir Henry Fowler, Wolverhampton, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman opposite had quoted only an isolated sentence from the argument in which he was dealing with the opinion which had been expressed adverse to the Bill and the charges brought against the Bill by some of the Bishops, and especially in an extraordinary speech by the Bishop of Manchester. Members of the Government were charged personally, individually and collectively, with promoting a Bill to carry out a scheme of confiscation against voluntary schools and to convert them into provided schools. The word "confiscation" was one which had not a shadow of truth in it in this connection. It was a misstatement both of the intention and the effect of the clause, and though his words might be open to the construction put upon them, what he meant to point out was that when the schools were taken over the local authority would be compelled to give the facilities when they were required. That argument he would repeat. He was a strong supporter of Clause 4 and would not support the Bill unless it contained that clause. It would be an act of injustice to denominational schools if the principle embodied in Clause 4 were not fully and fairly carried out. His right hon. friend had said, again and again, that he was determined that the clause should not be illusory, but a genuine *bona fide* means for carrying out the intention he expressed when introducing the Bill. The section completely saved the position of denominational schools. He would not say it was not capable of improvement, and he had no doubt that on the Report stage of the Bill his right hon. friend would be ready to make perfectly clear the intention that there should be no attempt to undo the effect of Clause 4.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said there was to his mind a little obscurity in the clause. The right of appeal would be given to all schools proposed to be transferred and to local authorities irrespectively of whether they were to have facilities under Clause 3, or extended facilities under Clause 4, and the Board of Education would have to decide under certain conditions. But he desired to know from the Solicitor-General under which clause would the Board decide if the school representatives appealed under Clause 4 and the local authorities under Clause 3. The Committee did not know anything about that. It must be quite obvious that the two sets of conditions were perfectly incompatible, and the position would not be improved by the passing of the new clause now before them.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 327. (Division List No. 230.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn.SirAlexF.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, HnMichael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Eevelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W. F.(BurySEdm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Lambton, Hon. Frenerick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F.(Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount

Walrond, Hon Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Major Seely and Mr. Cave.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H.(Essex, Romford)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, SirT.Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dickinson, W.H(St.Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford,S.
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Halslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham,
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen,W
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, WBateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras, E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles Mark
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt.Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Sir C. E (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Hon.C.H.W(Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. BIRRELL said that he thought the new clause which he had on the Paper dealing with schemes with reference to delegation very largely carried out the views expressed during the discussion on this important subject the other day, when there was a general consensus of opinion on both sides of the Committee that something should be done to revive interest, particularly in the rural districts, in the management, conduct, general character, and curriculum of the schools. Everybody thought the time had come for some measure of delegation in order to get rid of the bureaucratic spirit and to revive local interest in educational matters. There were certain small county councils which thought they could manage their own affairs without the expense and trouble of preparing schemes. They had fixed upon a population of less than 65,000 as a rough and ready way of determining what was a small county

LORD BALCARRES asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could give the names of the exempted councils.

MR. BIRRELL said they were the Isle of Ely, the Isles of Scilly, the Isle of Wight, the County of Huntingdon, Lincolnshire (Holland Division), the Soke of Peterborough, Rutland, Westmoreland, Anglesey, Brecon, Cardigan, Merioneth, Montgomery, and Radnor. According to the present census, those would be exempted. Such councils would have to state in a report the reasons why they did not propose to make a scheme, and those reasons would be the subject matter of criticism. Then they came to the provision that—

> "A scheme under this section may be altered or amended by a subsequent scheme made in accordance with the provisions thereof, and a county council may at any time make such a scheme for the purpose. A county council shall not be under any obligation to appoint managers under Section 6 of the Education Act, 1902, for a public elementary school if they consider that the management of the school is properly provided for by delegation to a representative body."

That was to secure that when these representative bodies were competent they would be allowed to continue to exercise their valuable functions and authority without being interfered with. Then the next provision in the clause provided that the accounts were to be made out and audited properly. He thought that the provisions in this respect were in the right direction. Sub-section (10) provided that—

> "Any council having powers under the Education Act, 1902, shall, in addition to the powers given by the foregoing provisions of this section, have power to delegate to any persons or body of persons, with or without any restrictions or conditions, as they think fit, any of their powers and duties under the Education Acts, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money, or the power to charge any expenses incurred under those Acts separately on any area."

That meant that they did not want to interfere with the power which the county councils had already of appointing administrative sub-committees, which power many county councils had exercised with great advantage. These administrative sub-committees were given much wider powers than they were given under this clause in regard to the delegation of authority. They did not want, however, to interfere with a county that had already established a sub-committee. Then the last provision was—

> "If any local authority who are elected by the local government or parochial electors of their area, or any representative body for any delegation area under this section, request the council of the county in which the area is situated to incur specially for the benefit of that area expenditure in relation to elementary education beyond the normal expenditure in the rest of the county, the county council may, if they think fit, charge the expenditure so incurred separately upon that area."

It would be observed that London was not included The question he had reserved to the last would be found in the second part of sub-section (1) of the clause, which provided that no power should be delegated of making a by-law under Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, or of incurring expenses in respect of capital expenditure or rent on account of the provision or improvement of a public elementary school and no power or duty in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers without prejudice, however, to any power of delegation (otherwise than by scheme) under this or any other Act. It was thought undesirable to allow these delegated bodies to interfere with these matters, although, as he had already stated, the clause secured that the county council might still delegate their powers to administrative sub-committees even if this power included the power of appointment or dismissal of teachers. That power of delegation which now existed had already been exercised in Cheshire and one or two other counties, and they did not want to interfere with the power which local authorities already had in this matter. Therefore the restriction was introduced that this clause should be without prejudice to any power of delegation under any other Act. Another provision was that—

> "Where powers and duties are delegated to a representative body, under a scheme made in pursuance of this section, the county council shall charge on the area for which the representative body acts (in this section referred to as 'the delegation area') the whole or some proportion of the expenses of carrying out the powers and duties delegated, of any amount of those expenses which exceeds some specified sum or limit, and may in addition, if provision is made for the purpose by the scheme, charge on the delegation area any expense which appears to the county council to have been caused by any neglect or default of the representative body to perform the duties delegated to them, or through the withholding of any grant due to any such neglect or default."

These powers he thought would secure that the authority to whom certain powers had been delegated must not abuse or neglect them, and it also provided for the expenditure of carrying out the provisions of the scheme in a uniform manner. The subsection also secured that the finances should not get into a state of confusion. He had now explained the whole clause. It was the result of a great deal of thought and labour and he hoped that it might prove to be of use.

Although the duties delegated might not be very large he hoped that they would be large enough to meet the desire expressed in the debate they had on the subject of reviving the interest, particularly in rural districts, in the great work of education.

New clause—

(1) The council of every county shall, subject to the provisions of this section, within two years after the passing of this Act, prepare a scheme for the purpose of delegating throughout their county to representative bodies as defined by this section some of their powers and duties with respect to elementary education, and shall as soon as may be after the passing of this Act obtain information for the purpose of making such a scheme by public local inquiries and other means.

"No power of making a by-law under Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, or of incurring expenses in respect of capital expenditure or rent on account of the provision or improvement of a public elementary school, and no power or duty in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers, shall be delegated under the scheme, without prejudice, however, to any power of delegation (otherwise than by scheme) under this or any other Act.

"(2) Where powers and duties are delegated to a representative body, under a scheme made in pursuance of this section, the county council shall charge on the area for which the representative body acts (in this section referred to as 'the delegation area') the whole or some proportion of the expenses of carrying out the power and duties delegated, or any amount of those expenses which exceeds some specified sum or limit, and may in addition if provision is made for the purpose by the scheme, charge on the delegation area any expense which appears to the county council to have been caused by any neglect or default of the representative body to perform the duties delegated to them, or through the withholding of any grant due to any such neglect or default.

"(3) The provisions of the scheme as to the powers and duties delegated, and as to the charging of expenses shall be uniform as respects all the delegation areas in the county.

"(4) A delegation area must be either a local government area or a combination of local government areas, and the areas combined need not necessarily be contiguous. A representative body must be either—(a) a body elected for the purpose in manner provided by the scheme by the local government or parochial electors for the delegation area, on which women shall be capable of being elected; or (b) the council of the local government area, where that is possible owing to the delegation area being a single local government area; or (c) a body composed of members of the councils of such local government areas wholly or partly situate in the delegation area as the scheme directs, and appointed by those councils in such manner and proportions and subject to such conditions as may be provided by the scheme, and, if the scheme so directs, of additional members nominated in manner provided by the scheme, and not exceeding in number one-fourth of the total number of the representative body; For the purposes of this provision in the case of a local government area being a parish not having a parish council, parochial electors shall be substituted for members of the parish council, and the parish meeting shall be substituted for the parish council. Women shall be capable of being nominated as such additional members, and the scheme shall provide for the inclusion of some women amongst the members so nominated.

"(5) Every scheme prepared under this section shall be submitted to the Board of Education, and shall be approved by the Board if they are satisfied that proper inquiries have been made before preparing the scheme, and that an opportunity has been given to persons interested in the matter for expressing their views on any scheme so prepared, and that the scheme is within the powers given by this section. On the approval of a scheme by the Board of Education, the scheme shall have effect as if enacted by this Act.

"(6) If, after obtaining information for the purpose of a scheme under this section, the council of a county having a population according to the last census of less than 65,000, pass a resolution that a scheme is not necessary in their case having regard to the special circumstances of their county, and make a special report on the subject to the Board of Education, the Board of Education may, if they think fit, exempt that council from the obligation to make a scheme under this section, but the council may at any time, if they think fit, make such a scheme, although the scheme is not prepared within the time limited by this section.

"(7) A scheme under this section may be altered or amended by a subsequent scheme made in accordance with the provisions thereof, and a county council may at any time make such a scheme for the purpose.

"(8) A county council shall not be under any obligation to appoint managers under section 6 of the Education Act, 1902, for a public elementary school if they consider that the management of the school is properly provided for by delegation to a representative body.

"(9) The accounts of the receipts and expenditure of a representative body under this section shall be made up and audited in like manner and subject to the same provisions (including penal provisions) as the accounts of a local education authority. Provided that if, in any case, the Local Government Board so determine, those accounts shall be audited as accounts of the county council, and in that case the auditor shall have the same power with respect to members of the representative body and their officers as he would have if those members and officers were officers of the county council.

"(10) Any council having powers under the Education Act, 1902, shall, in addition to the powers given by the foregoing provisions of this section, have power to delegate to any persons or body of persons, with or without any restrictions or conditions, as they think fit any of their powers and duties under the Education Acts, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money, or the power to charge any expenses incurred under those Acts separately on any area.

"(11) If any local authority who are elected by the local government or parochial electors of their area, or any representative body for any delegation area under this section, request the council of the county in which the area is situated to incur specially for the benefit of that area expenditure in relation to elementary education beyond the normal expenditure in the rest of the county, the county council may, if they think fit, charge the expenditure so incurred separately upon that area.

"(12) In this section—The expression 'county' does not include a county borough or the county of London, and does not include any part of a county which is not included in the area of the county council as local education authority under Part 3 of the Education Act, 1902. The expression 'local government area' means a borough, an urban or a rural district council, or a parish—"

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That this clause be now read a second time."

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) thought the new clause was in many respects better than the old one. But one part, sub-section (10) was absolutely against direct popular control. He had always thought that that was an idea which the Liberal Party held very strongly. It was not necessary, apparently, that a single member of the administrative sub-committee should be popularly elected. How was it possible for a Government which came in on the cry of popular control to bring in a provision of that sort? He thought it must be an oversight on the part of the President of the Board of Education, as it was directly in the teeth of the utterances of prominent members of the Party opposite. He thought the Committee would agree with him that it was impossible for Members on the Ministerial side of the House who were elected on the cry of direct popular control to support a clause such as this unless it was amended by the President of the Board of Education.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) said that the proposed clause was extremely long and the machinery extremely complicated. The right hon. Gentleman had not contended that any advantage could be derived from it except that its main object was to stimulate interest in education in country parishes. It was very difficult to say whether the clause would stimulate educational interest in rural districts; he himself thought it would have the opposite effect. Then London was exempted; but if there was need for devolution in any of the counties of England there was far more need for it in the county of London than elsewhere. Why should the London County Council be the only council which was not to have its administrative area broken up and put into the melting pot? Reference had been made to the London School Board and to its abolition, but he should like to know what would have been said on the Ministerial side of the House if there had been an attempt to break up the School Board for London by putting another body between the board and its own managers who were in contact with the schools. If he remembered rightly it was the Party opposite that steadily resisted the association of the borough councils with the education of London. They thought that to add another representative body directly responsible to its own electorate, in some respects different from that of the County Council, would lead to friction, to reproaches, and would injure the education of London. He was no opponent of a system of devolution if the system was elastic and if every local authority was to make a scheme best suited to its own area, but he did object to bringing in small authorities and managers of schools. That seemed to him to be a dual control that must make for friction and expenditure. These minor authorities were to have the control of repairs, of caretakers, of the purchase of school materials, and the enforcing of attendance. To take the case of the purchase of school materials, he knew of a county council which saved, literally, £1,000 on the cost of school materials by taking over the purchase and buying from a wholesale man instead of "round the corner." None of the other duties handed over to these minor authorities were duties worth having; neither the control of caretakers nor repairs, which were trivial, had the slightest interest for the ratepayers. The one matter which did interest the parents and in which they wished to have some control was the appointment of the teacher. He would be strongly opposed to handing over the fixing of the salary to them, because he believed they would pay niggardly salaries, but he would be prepared to allow the managers to be appointed by the parish council and to allow the managers to appoint the teachers. That was done in the West Riding of Yorkshire and in the county of the education authority of which he was a member. The managers should always appoint the teacher subject to the veto of the county council. It was for the reason that the powers given by this clause were not the powers the people wanted; because it added machinery which would do very little work; because it would not stimulate that interest that it was supposed to do, that he opposed the clause as it stood. In his opinion this extra authority sandwiched in between the county council and the managers could only make for confusion, expense, and maladministration.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that as he understood his right hon. friend, sub-section (10) of this clause had been specially put in in order to cover the case of county councils which had schemes already, like the county council of the West Riding of Yorkshire and the Cheshire County Council. Those county councils had already appointed committees under the Act of 1902 and given them power to deal with certain administrative matters which this clause in an earlier sub-section excluded from the powers to be delegated to the representative bodies. What he wished to ask his right hon. friend was whether, if it had been thought by the Government that a certain amount of freedom should be allowed to those county councils which had thought it expedient that in arranging this machinery the local committees they had appointed under the Act of 1902 should have certain powers both with regard to the school buildings and the provision of school accommodation, and the recommendation and the appointment and dismissal of school teachers—whether, having regard to the fact that sub-section (10) was placed in this clause on the express ground that it was to displace the provision that sanctioned the policy adopted by these county councils in respect to these points, he could not see his way to allowing the same latitude and freedom of discretion to other county councils to deal with the areas for which they were responsible. He did not wish to elaborate the question now. He merely wished to put it to his right hon. friend that, having admitted the reasonableness of the policy of these county councils, he could not open the door to other county councils to deal with their areas in a similar way. It seemed to him that sub-section (10) as it stood was extremely obscure and could hardly stand in its present form. He hoped the clause would be read a second time with unanimity. They were deeply grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for bringing the clause in in the improved form in which it now stood, and also to his hon. friend the Member for Middleton and those who had worked with him in first preparing it.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) wished to join with the hon. Member for Northamptonshire in most heartily thank the Government and the Minister for Education for bringing in this clause. The hon. Member for South Birmingham, who had opposed the clause altogether, had treated it as a measure for destroying the county council administration. He (Mr. Adkins) thought that of those who were in favour of the clause not one would accept that description of it. The very object, intention, and method of the clause was to unite to the existing county council administration such delegation as the county council itself might decide to have in its area. When the hon. Member for South Birmingham objected to the system of delegation to representative bodies that of course was the point upon which the issue was joined in that debate. But to say that to delegate to representative bodies was therefore to have dual control was to use a phrase which was unintentionally but thoroughly misleading. What was the universal fact of the local government law of England? They had the parish and the district and the county. Any device which forgot any of those three areas was bound to fall and to be injured by such forgetfulness. And just as now the district councils had certain authority and county councils had superior authority in many of those matters, so, in addition, many of them would wish the district to have some authority and financial responsibility in educational matters, while fully maintaining the supremacy of the body governing the county area. He thought the onus of proof was upon those who wished to have different geographical arrangements for education rather than upon those who wished to assimilate education in this respect to local government in general. There were two other matters which he would like to raise. One was the question of sub-section (10) of this clause, which undoubtedly awoke great interest. He would suggest that all existing methods of delegation, including the excellent experiments tried in Cheshire, the West Riding, and elsewhere, w re absolutely and completely reserved by the words at the end of Sub-clause (1), which were—

> "Without prejudice to any power of delegation otherwise than by scheme under this or any other Act."

That preserved all existing delegation, and he thought that that would prevent Cheshire or the West Riding or any other great county council from feeling that any power now belonging to them was taken away or hampered by this clause. But when they proceeded from maintaining what existed to adding to that general method of delegation, then he thought many Members on both sides of the House would be sorry that indefinite methods of delegation should be given in addition when this clause suggested that the proper method of delegation was to predominantly representative bodies. He hoped the Minister for Education would be able to tell them that the words in the first sub-section were adequate for the very laudable purpose of retaining present methods, and that therefore he would be able to leave out sub-clause (10), which gave very wide and indefinite powers which might conceivably detract from the impetus which they hoped county councils would have for putting into force the rest of the clause. With regard to the sub-section relating to small counties, it by no means followed that these counties would not prepare any scheme of delegation. It really meant that where the geographical necessity was not so obvious, the question would be referred to the Board of Education. The object was to excite local interest and bring education nearer to the homes of the electors and citizens, and that was not likely to be foregone because of a resolution passed by one or two county councils. He hoped the Government who had adopted this clause would use all their powers to pass it into law. He hoped they would not be friendly to any Amendments which would diminish the power of the delegation suggested, and that they would be willing to consider sympathetically the suggestion that sub-section (10) should not be allowed to override or impair in any way the efficacy of the rest of the clause. It had been laid down that the powers of making the by-laws in regard to school attendance should be reserved to the county councils. He thought they would all be ready to agree to that. With regard to the carrying out of those bye-laws, he thought that might be freely left to the council. There was one thing which English county councils specially prided themselves upon and it was the success in regard to school attendance which had attended their efforts during the last few years, and there was not the faintest danger of their delegating that power to any incompetent body. In large centres of population in Lancashire and Yorkshire it might be desirable to delegate the enforcing of school attendance. If such duties were not discharged thoroughly there was the power for penalising any district which was the means of losing funds. With those checks he hoped the Government would be willing to retain the clause in its present form without in any way diminishing delegation as provided under it.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said there was a general agreement in the Committee that the President of the Board of Education had endeavoured to carry out his promise with regard to this clause. He thought delegation should be stimulated in all our large areas. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that this new clause was the result of much thought, and he regretted that it did not find expression earlier in the history of the Bill, for then they might have had a longer time to study this new proposal, which really was a small Bill in itself. Under these circumstances he would like to call attention to two or three points; one was the enormous labour which would be thrown upon the Board of Education by this Bill. This measure threw upon the Board of Education a number of new duties of a very delicate, contentious, and difficult character. It would have to decide in the future a great many points. It would have to listen to appeals, express approval of certain acts, and it would very shortly have to adjust extremely difficult and complicated relations with the Education Department for Wales, and at the same time whilst parting with some of those powers and duties, it would have to reorganise a complicated system of control over the local authorities in Wales and the Department which was to control education in the Principality. In addition to all this the Board of Education under this proposal would have to approve a number of schemes sent up by large local authorities. Any one who had had any experience of bringing into operation the Act of 1902 and the settlement and official approval of the schemes then submitted to the Board of Education would at once realise that they were throwing a very heavy burden upon that Department. Some of the delegation areas might be very small and minor local authorities with no very great position. He would like to know whether it was proposed to delegate to them some of the very complicated and difficult matters which would have to be decided under this Bill. The local education authority might have several urban districts with a population of more than 5,000. Would they be permitted to delegate the decision of questions arising under Clause 4? Was it to be permitted to any delegation area that they should determine whether a new school offered to the local authority under Section 5 was to be accepted or not? He thought that was a matter in regard to which the education authority ought to retain its powers. On the other hand the reservation in regard to the teachers seemed to be a rather serious flaw. He thought the localities should have some voice in the selection of teachers, and some power of approving or suggesting the persons who were to teach in their schools. He thought that was a very important matter. These were points which he thought the Government had considered hardly sufficiently.

MR. STUART (Sunderland) said that taking the clause as a whole he considered it a very fair one. He quite agreed with the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University who had just referred to the engagement and selection of teachers. There was certainly an opportunity there for giving some power to the local authorities which would be of advantage not only in connection with the schools themselves but in the encouragement of persons to take part in local bodies. He believed it would be found that the management of groups of schools was really the best method to adopt. He hoped, however, the Government would be prepared to withdraw the paragraph empowering councils to delegate to any persons or body of persons any of their powers under the Education Acts, except the powers of raising a rate, borrowing money, and of charging expenses separately on any area. That paragraph was contrary to the general spirit of the rest of the clause, which was to delegate powers to elective bodies. There would be a want of security generally in the clause if they felt that in passing it they were allowing county and town councils to delegate their powers in the way proposed by that paragraph. He knew there were cases where there was some similar delegation, and he hoped it would be preserved. He also hoped that nothing would induce the Government to touch the question o London in the Bill.

LORD BALCARRES said that although on the whole the new clause was a good one, he differed very much in regard to sub-section (10). The President of the Board of Education had merely referred to it, and had not stated his case for inserting that sub-section. It appeared to him to supersede the rest of the delegation clauses. It was in addition to the powers conferred in the previous sub-sections; without any restriction or conditions the local authority could devolve any of their powers upon two or more persons. That meant that a great council like Lancashire or the West Riding of Yorkshire could nominate two persons to whom the whole of their duties could be delegated. That was inconceivable. As he read the clause he did not think any section of the Committee would be inclined to support it. He rather gathered that during the previous debate there was a good deal of hostility shown towards taking the parish as the unit for delegation. The word "parish" was a very elastic term; it might mean a place with 200 or 300 inhabitants, or one with 15,000 inhabitants which was not an urban district, and would be excluded under Clause 4. Such a parish, he took it, would be included in the new delegation clause. They were all aware of the complexity of a problem which, for example, took the parish as a unit of delegation, there being small rural parishes with a few hundreds of inhabitants up to Islington with its population of 340,000. There were also sparsely populated counties of large area, but the fact that the population was sparse did not in any way remove the educational need for delegation, for the sparseness of population and the difficulty of communication must tend to centralise the work of education in those districts. He urged, moreover, that it was important in the interests of delegation that the subjects delegated should not be of a character likely to excite local hostility. The teachers were to be excluded from these powers. He gathered from the expressions of approval from hon. Members opposite that some of them thought that the appointment of teachers should also be delegated. His opinion was that all the questions affecting the selection of the educational machinery for the schools should be left for many reasons to the central authority, and that it would be unwise to allow the delegated authority to administer the by-laws. Such questions as rent and capital cost, must, of course, be excluded, but there was an ambiguity which he should like explained as to whether the word "improvement" also included repairs. With regard to such questions as the provision of apparatus and the carrying out of repairs no money was going to be saved by this clause. If they bought things retail they cost more than if they were bought in the gross. All the charges brought against the local authorities of raising the rates might be true from some points of view, but the economies they had effected by buying in gross had more than counterbalanced the extra cost of administration. The hon. Member for Middleton had given particular attention to this subject, and he always listened to his views with great respect. He thought, however, there was always a certain amount of danger in delegating the enforcement of local by-laws, School attendance, was, of course, excluded, and he did not think anyone would suggest that it ought to be delegated. Nothing would be more popular than to allow the local authority to settle the question of school attendance, but nothing could be more injurious to education. He would be very sorry to see the interpretation and enforcement of the by-laws made a subject of contest at a parish council election. His chief doubt was in regard to the curriculum. He understood that that could be delegated. Local conditions varied so much that it might be difficult for the central local authority of some great area to make provision for all the varying interests which were affected by the school curriculum. Lancashire had every imaginable kind of local interest and conditions which might make one central code a matter of complaint between one district and another. None the less he thought the local education authorities were quite competent to alter the curriculum for their own particular district to meet local requirements. Was it not better that the central authority which, *ipso facto*, approached these questions from a more disinterested point of view than the smaller authority, should settle these matters in the general interests of the county, and deal with all the large questions affecting the curriculum? He did not like to make this mandatory on the local education authority. He looked at it from the point of view of Lancashire where the local authorities had done extraordinarily well. There were passive resisters on the Central

Committee, but that had not prevented them from working with extraordinary loyalty and enthusiasm for the administration of the Act. He did not like to say to a county with such a local education authority that a scheme must be produced for every parish in its area. But he saw the necessity for it from the point of view of the right hon. Gentleman who felt that unless he put in the word "must" at the beginning he would find that some authorities would and others would not carry out the requirements of the clause. He did not know whether there was any state of mind between "may" and "must," but if there was a compromise between these two conditions, he should very much like to see it introduced at the beginning of this section. The Bill provided that the delegation had to be done within two years of the passing of the Act—that was to say, within two years from 1st January, 1908, when the Act was to come into operation. The time given for carrying out this system of delegation was too short. His hon. friend the Member for Oxford University had pointed out what was incontestable, that this Act was going to place an incalculable burden upon the Education Department. All the points to which his hon. friend had referred, and which would have ultimately to be settled by the Board of Education, would have to be considered in the first instance by the local education authorities. To his mind that was a perfectly sufficient reason for arguing that the two years should be extended to three or even four. There were other cogent reasons for giving more time. This was a gigantic clause, and to put it in operation in Lancashire alone would mean the preparation of hundreds of schemes. In the end no doubt a model scheme would be devised, but that, in itself was a work of immense magnitude. The burden of preparing all these schemes would be so great that it might from several points of view endanger the good working of the machine. Our system of educational finance was, he would not say, in a state of chaos, but it was in a state of confusion. The President of the Board of Education had announced that next year he proposed to introduce legislation which would unify the system. That, of course, was an excellent proposal, but he thought it came a year too soon. This new clause dealt largely with finance, and he did not think the legislation to unify the financial system should be introduced until the claus e came into force. He imagined that the Bill next year which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to introduce would come into operation on 31st March, 1908, just when the local authorities of the country were providing schemes of delegation. Therefore, within a few months of the completion of their labours the schemes might have to be modified in view of the new scheme for amalgamating the system of finance. It was not his intention to make a hostile speech in regard to this clause. He believed in the principle of delegation. He was sure that if a little extra time were allowed better schemes would be made from the point of view of the local authority. If the local education authorities were hurried and offended in this matter, the intention to re-establish local interest in education would be frustrated.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) urged that the area of delegation must not be too large, so that parents of all classes might take part in the work of managing the schools, and regain that control which the Act of 1902 had tended to take away. What was wanted was that working men should be able to attend the meetings of the local bodies to whom duties were delegated. It would be perfectly impossible in many cases for working men to be on the present local authorities. He hoped, therefore, that the county authorities would frame comprehensive schemes which would enable all classes to take part in the work of the local bodies. When they were discussing the Act of 1902 they were told again and again by the late Prime Minister that it would do away entirely with one man management. The fact was, however, that it had introduced one man management everywhere. They all felt that the Act of 1902 ought to have provided for an extension of the old school board system established in 1870. He agreed with what the hon. Member for Sunderland said on a former occasion that the work done under the 1902 Act had been very much scamped because the local authorities had not time to overtake the burden placed upon them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR desired to have from the President of the Board of Education some idea of the powers to be delegated, some sketch scheme. He did not know if the right hon. Gentleman would think it worth while to adopt the hint from his noble friend to substitute "may" for "shall." The Government scheme excluded from the obligatory duty certain authorities below a certain limit, and that was right; but he was not sure that it would not be well to allow more elasticity, and if a council could show reasons why it should not be required to prepare a scheme of the kind, the Board of Education might have a power of dispensation. He was not quite sure how such a scheme as was contemplated would work in harmony with existing arrangements. For instance, he believed that the Cheshire Council had an elaborate scheme in working. If any county had a scheme in operation and could show it was working well, that might be sufficient. This was really an experiment, and possibly a county might be able to show that this scheme in the conditions existing would do more harm than good. He was utterly unable to see why London should be excluded. The conflict of authority in London was not greater than in many great educational areas. If there was any truth for the allegation that county councils were overworked, it would certainly apply to London, with a population of 5,000,000 and a child population of 750,000. Why insist upon delegation for Lancashire or the West Riding and not for London? He was in favour of more elasticity over the whole country, but if these great communities were brought within the scope of the proposal there was no reason in theory or in practice for excluding London.

DR. MACNAMARA said that London occupied a different position in many ways. They must stand by unified rating for London at all costs; the more they broke up London the more they increased differentiation of rating. Unified rating must be secured before entering upon devolution. He was very hopeful that under the new system of management managers would have more duties devolved upon them. From an educational point of view he regarded this proposal for devolution with great anxiety, and he might even say with a great deal of misgiving. He would have taken larger areas, cutting them up into proportions of Poor Law unions and giving complete control, with devolution of certain powers to managers. This was a big undertaking, and in many cases he feared machinery would be set up that would be turned to no useful purpose. He had notice of an Amendment to turn "shall" into "may," but he did not know that he should press it. The Leader of the Opposition made a valuable suggestion when he said the Board of Education might have power of dispensation if a council thought it undesirable to cut up the county. Only the larger parishes should be allowed to become delegation areas. To the powers reserved he would add the enforcing of by-laws. Certain powers of selecting teachers might be given. In regard to the question of capital expenditure he thought it was quite properly reserved. In reference to the reservation in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers, nobody suggested that the question of the salaries should not be reserved, but a number of hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House thought that the delegation body should have some power in regard to the appointment of the teacher. But even if the words of the clause were left in their present form, the county council would still be capable of devolving large powers in this respect upon the delegation authority. The delegation authority might look through the applications for the appointment and might sift down the applicants to a certain number, while the ultimate appointment of the teacher was left to the county council. The noble Lord had said that nothing would give a parish council greater pleasure than to appoint a teacher. In his judgment nothing would give them greater pleasure than to dismiss a teacher. But they ought to have the power to do something in reference to the appointment of a teacher in the way of recommendation, even if they did not have the ultimate appointment. The President of the Board of Education had pleaded very eloquently for a revival of the direct interest of women in educational work, but he would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that under the clause as it now stood, in certain parts of the country women would not be eligible for election on these delegated bodies unless the system of election of borough councils was reformed. As to subsection (10) he need not go into that now, because he had an Amendment upon the paper to strike it out. He did not understand it, and to his mind it was an amazing proposal, because it would put the direction of education, except in regard to the power of raising a rate or borrowing money or the charging of expenses, into the hands of the clergyman and the curate. He did not think that the subsection could be allowed to stand as it was, and at the proper time he should move to omit it.

*MR. LANE-FOX (Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash) said that the new Government delegation clause was a distinct improvement in many ways upon that which it had displaced. But in some ways it did not go far enough. One point which had not been touched upon was the incidence of the rates. He wished to urge upon the Committee that where they had rural areas alongside progressive urban areas it was very unfair that the same principle of rating should obtain. When they had a congested population it was possible for them to develop their system of education, but where they came to the population outside those areas they could not receive the same benefits from the rates which they were paying. In the West Riding at the present time in regard to secondary and also elementary education the benefit received from the education given was much greater in the urban than in the rural districts. He quite agreed that the powers of delegation given were small—he wished they were larger—but small as they were the expenses incurred should be in proportion to the benefit received by the area. The expenses incurred should be in the details of management and maintenance. When the whole question of the ordering of small articles had to go through a great many hands there must be a great deal of expense. If these matters were given over to the delegation authority a considerable reduction would result. It was only fair that where certain districts were receiving certain benefits those districts should pay for them. He did not wish to add to the length of the discussion, but there were one or two other points in the clause to which he objected. He wished to re-echo what had been said as to the objection to small areas. There were few Members of the House who wished to go back to the school board system. The question of the differentiation of the rate might come in here. If they had a parish council or any other small body of that sort dealing with the question there might be injustice to one parish as compared with another which was either poorer or more wealthy, but if they had the area sufficiently large this would not arise. There should be some limit of population in the areas. At present no such limit was imposed by the clause, and he thought it might very well be inserted, There was also the question of the appointment of teachers. He did not believe they would ever get delegation bodies to take a proper interest in their duties unless they gave them sufficient work to do, and if there was one thing more than another in which such bodies were interested it was in the appointment of the teachers. These were matters which would make all the difference in the work done by the delegation bodies. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stick to his proposal to make the clause take a compulsory form, for it was the only means by which they could obtain uniformity. The clause was a great improvement and would afford relief from the hopeless congestion of work existing in some counties.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said it seemed to him that this was one of the most important clauses that had been introduced. He thought it was an excellent idea that a scheme should be prepared by every county council after a public local inquiry had been held. What he thought required a little explanation was subsection (3), which spoke of uniformity in regard to delegation areas. He hoped that the Committee would agree that these schemes must differ in some respects, because one part of the county might possibly require one set of rules and regulations and another part of the county might require a different set. Had the right hon. Gentleman fully considered how difficult it was to get that uniformity which apparently was mandatory under sub-section (3)? He was afraid women would be excluded from the education authority in some districts unless the clause was made more definite in its references to them. For instance, under section 4, sub-section (c), a scheme might, or might not, provide for the nomination of additional members. In a later part of the clause it provided for "the inclusion of some women amongst the members so nominated." If, therefore, a scheme did not provide for the nomination of additional members, "the inclusion of some women" would be an impossibility, although nominally compulsory. He wished the whole clause had been made more frankly democratic by the introduction, fully and completely of the *ad hoc* system; but he joined in thanking the right hon. Gentleman for the clause so far as it went.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) pointed out that, owing to the system of the pooling of the rates, the rural districts had suffered very severely. One curious result had been that up to now the ratepayers in rural districts had been paying for the building of schools in urban districts and actually for interest on the old debt incurred by School Boards. So far as he could make out, even under this clause that manifest injustice would continue, and he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not see his way to make provision for the rent of schools and the interest on building loans or previous debts in any delegated area being paid for by the area concerned instead of by the whole country. If that were done, he thought a large grievance would be removed from rural districts, and that the general system of rating for the purposes of education would be a great deal more fair than at present. He imagined that there would also have to be differentiation in the grants and that the schools in each delegated area would be paid the grants they earned instead of the grants of all the schools in the whole county being pooled together as the rates were at present. He would be very glad if the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to do something on these points.

MR. BIRRELL said he was fully alive to the grievance mentioned by the noble Lord, but to touch on that thorny question would be entirely outside the scope of the clause. He hoped the Government might soon be able to deal with it, but he could not make any promises as to what the legislation of next session would be. He could not respond altogether to the Leader of the Opposition, who had invited him to state what would be the delegated duties. The clause was careful to state what powers should not be delegated; but he thought they were all agreed that the duties should include the duties of management, a voice, though not a final voice, in settling the curriculum of the school, a voice in the selection of teachers, though not their actual appointment, and generally that sort of thing. The right hon. Gentleman had also asked him about the religious question. Of course he need scarcely say that nothing was further from the intention of the Government, and he hoped nothing would be further from the minds of any county council, than to delegate such contentious and thorny questions to these bodies, and if words were necessary to make it clear that they were not to be delegated, they should be inserted. There seemed to be a feeling prevailing in the House in favour of keeping the clause compulsory, and that there should be a genuine attempt made by all educational authorities, except those who could claim exemption under the clause, to devolve some portion of their duties. He thought that, on the whole, the Government would have to adhere to the compulsory character of the scheme. With regard to delegation under the Act of 1902, the Government did not for a moment propose to interfere with the power of appointing sub-committees under that Act. He did not want to take away from progressive county councils the power of delegation to their own sub-committees, which had worked so well in the past. Therefore, although it was open to the criticism of there being possibly a dual authority, acting partly under delegated powers under this scheme and partly under the Act of 1902, he was afraid that could not be avoided. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had made some very valuable remarks about London. London was left out for no other reason except that it was so big, but there was no reason why it should not delegate some of its educational work to other bodies. He questioned whether the time would not come when it would be better for the London County Council to hand over its educational work to a body without any other duties. He was unable to say to what extent that feeling existed, but he had received deputations and had spoken to many Members of the London County Council, and he believed the time would very soon come when that body would have to deal with its own educational problem on the footing of having a separate education authority of its own. He thought London pressed in a more violent way than any other part of the country and required stronger efforts than could be made under this clause. He was afraid they could not add to their difficulties by bringing London within the purview of the clause. He felt he must recommend the clause as it was, and he hoped they might now read it a second time. Difficulties had been raised about subsection (10). He did not know that it was necessary, and he did not propose to insist upon it. It was really only put in out of a desire to safeguard the powers of delegation under the Act of 1902. If there was a feeling against the subsection, so long as they did not do anything to deprive educational authorities of powers they already possessed, which had worked admirably well in the past, where people had been keen and eager about the subject, he was content. He hoped the Committee would now allow the clause to be read a second time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

VISCOUNT MORPETH moved as an Amendment to the proposed new clause to substitute "may" for "shall" in line 1. There might be cases in which devolution was not necessary, and where it was not desired. Then there were county councils which had already made schemes, some of which were working excellently. He thought it would be a pity to interfere with those schemes. The right hon. Gentleman himself had admitted that there might be confusion, as there might be the old delegation and the new delegation working side by side. In order to avoid that confusion he proposed that the clause should be optional to counties, and that a county council should be able to say to the Board of Education that they already had a scheme of devolution or delegation that met the wishes of the county.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 1, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the proposed new clause."

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.) said that for the reasons given a moment ago by his right hon. friend it would be impossible to accept this Amendment. It was much more desirable that the matter should be definitely stated in the Act. The effect of the Amendment would be to throw discretion on the Board of Education, which would greatly add to its trouble and labour.

LORD BALCARRES said the scheme had got to go to the Board anyhow, and if the Amendment were accepted the labours of the Board would be reduced by the number of cases in which the local authority did not desire to make a scheme. The Leader of the Opposition had suggested a scheme for a kind of "half-way house" between obligation and option. If that Amendment were accepted the clause would then read:—

"If after obtaining information for the purpose of a scheme under this section the council of any county pass a Resolution that a scheme is not necessary"—

then the Board could absolve them from carrying their scheme into effect. That would be a kind of compromise which was supported by a good many persons who did not want to force this matter on the local authorities.

*Mr. ADKINS said that many of them hoped that the Government would neither accept this Amendment nor respond to the suggestion of the noble Lord. In the proposal embodied in the clause there was a definite new policy of devolution to representative bodies throughout the country, and that definite and clear principle many of them demanded should be laid down by Parliament without any exception, or with as little exception as possible. The different needs of different counties would be adequately met by the varied scope of the clause, which enabled them to go more or less into detail, and surely it was a sound principle of government that the guiding principle should be laid down by Parliament, and that great authorities should have ample scope as to the degree in which they applied the principle. He therefore thanked the Government for making this clause mandatory. However good any existing scheme of devolution in any county was it could not have that element of representative government and delegated financial responsibility which this clause gave.

Mr. BIRRELL said he still thought there might very well be reasons in the smaller counties why they should not have imposed upon them this duty. He did not think it was desirable, for the reasons he had stated, to accept the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. He recognised that something might be said of the course suggested by the hon. Gentleman, but they must adhere to their main purpose, which was that it was the duty of all these local authorities to provide at the earliest possible moment—though they had allowed the reasonable period of two years—a scheme which should secure some devolution.

Amendment negatived.

Viscount MORPETH moved to leave out the words "throughout their county to representative bodies as defined by this section." He said it was quite conceivable that the county council might desire to set up a scheme in one part of the county and not in another. The right hon. Gentleman had given a choice of three representative bodies for devolution purposes, The hon. Member for Middleton said he desired to assimilate educational administration to the rest of the county administration. But they did not give the care of the same roads to the county council and the local sanitary authority. They gave a highway road to one and the lesser roads to the other authority. If the same road were given to the two separate authorities he did not think the state of the roads would be as good as at the present time. He objected to giving these powers to representative bodies, because they were responsible to an electorate of their own, and were in a position, not only to contest the decisions of the county council but to agitate for and insist upon further powers being given than those provided under this clause.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 3, to leave out after the word 'delegating' to the word 'some' in line 4."—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

Mr. LOUGH said that this Amendment would practically destroy the whole clause. It would allow powers to be delegated in one part of the county, while in other parts of the county no powers of delegation would exist at all. He did not think the illustrations that the noble Lord had given of the way in which county work was carried on were really relevant to the objects which the supporters of the clause had in view, and this Amendment would strike at the root of the object which the Government desired in carrying the clause.

Viscount MORPETH said he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON moved to exclude from the powers of these delegation areas any questions arising out of the transfer of voluntary schools under the new Bill, or the granting of facilities. He could not help thinking that the representative of the Board of Education would agree with him in this matter. There were very important questions that would arise if a new school were built and applied to be taken over by the local education authority under Clause 5; or, again, if an urban district became a delegation area with a population of over 5,000, and facilities were claimed under Clause 4. Important and difficult questions might arise, which should be dealt with by the local authority. He believed that an appeal would lie to the Board of Education and that should certainly not come from a minor local authority or a body with delegated powers, but should come from the local authority itself. The withdrawal of facilities was a possibility under Clause 4, and that was a question which might create excitement in the locality.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"At the commencement of line 8, to insert 'No powers in respect of the transfer of voluntary schools or the grant or withdrawal of facilities for religious instruction of some special character, and'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. CHANNING said it was conceivable that such powers might be delegated to a town which had been a responsible centre for education before, and where obviously the powers would be exercised with the same sense of responsibility and consideration for all concerned as they would be by the county council. He could quite imagine that in Lancashire and Yorkshire and in some of the Midland counties, for example, the county council might wisely delegate some of their powers with regard to the transfer of schools to a subordinate authority. He hoped, however, that the Government would not accept this Amendment. In the cases to which the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University had referred it was clear that no county council would think of delegating such powers to subordinate authorities.

MR. LOUGH reminded the Committee that his right hon. friend the Minister for Education had earlier that afternoon said he had no intention of plunging these new bodies into religious disputes, but that all such questions would be settled by the head authority. At a later stage the Government would introduce an Amendment to make this quite clear, and would carry out the intention which the hon. Baronet had in view. He hoped, therefore, that the Amendment now before the Committee would not be pressed.

*MR. ADKINS thought the object of the hon. Baronet might be met by words which would secure that these controversial duties should not be included in any scheme under the clause and still allow the county council power in special cases to delegate outside the scheme such matters as had been referred to by the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire. He thought they would all agree with the hon. Baronet that it was very undesirable that duties of a highly contentious character should be delegated to small areas.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that in the interests of good administration they ought not to disturb the delegation area by putting before them matters which were bound to raise heart-burning and local feeling. He thanked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education for the promise he had made. but he hoped it was clearly understood that no question arising from the transfer of these schools or facilities for granting special religious instruction would be delegated to any delegation area. He asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT MORPETH proposed an Amendment with the object of making it impossible for the power of enforcing school attendance by-laws to be delegated. He contended that if that power were to be handed over to the rural districts, it would be left to the relieving officers and, owing to the fact that they had other things to think about, it would be neglected. The result would be that the standard of attendance which had been so much improved would fall back again. Education would suffer and the exchequer of the county would lose.

He therefore thought his Amendment was essential, and he begged to moved.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 8, after the word 'making' to insert the words 'or enforcing.'"—(*Lord Morpeth.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. ADKINS said they were all agreed that the important duty of keeping up of the standard of attendance was a vital matter, and that the by-law governing the matter should be restricted to the county councils. It was at present enforced by a body humourously called a sub-committee of the county council, but which was a body in some districts at whose meetings a county councillor was seldom present. It by no means followed that if the noble Lord's Amendment was not accepted the county councils would delegate the power of enforcing attendance. All that those who opposed the Amendment asked was that the county councils should be left free to deal with the matter. Of all things in which a county council could be trusted it could safely be trusted to do nothing which would lower the rate of attendance, because it would thereby lose Government grants and add a burden to the rates. He was quite certain that most county councils in the country would never delegate this power, and that they would take precautions that such work was adequately done. He hoped the Secretary to the Board of Education would not agree to the Amendment, not because they did not agree with the noble Lord's aim, but because they did not think this proposal would assist him in the attainment of his object.

Mr. LOUGH said the Government could not accept the Amendment. He understood that the power of delegating existed at present to some extent, and it was not the intention of the Government to limit that power as it existed.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON pointed out that it might lead to friction unless the same body that made the by-laws enforced them. The local authority made the by-laws and it told the minor authority to enforce them, and that was not likely to lead to harmony. In these smaller self-governing areas they might not care to enforce the attendance by-laws made by the authority of the larger area.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 45; Noes, 262. (Division List No. 231.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHnSirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Barnes, G. N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, P. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in Furness
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey, F.WF(BuryS.Edm'ds
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Magnus. Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Shackleton, David James
Summerbell, T.
Thomson, W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Viscount Morpeth and Mr. Bridgeman.

NOES

Abraham, William (Cork. N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland
Allen, A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott(Somers.
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beaumont, W.C.B.(Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir JWilliams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H.(Essex, Romford)

Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce,J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm.J(S.Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W.Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dickinson, W.H(S.Pancras, N.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme Norval Watson
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever,W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kednal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool/
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,J. Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, De R. (Leicester)
WallaceRobert H,.

Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H, (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease

*MR. CHANNING moved to insert in line 11 of the proposed new clause relating to delegation schemes the words "except where the county council has authorised any proposal and estimate relating thereto." He explained that in this Amendment he had placed the suggestion that the county councils should have a free hand to delegate some powers as to the provision of school accommodation or improvement or hire of schools in the most restricted form. He hoped the Government might be able to accept the Amendment or agree to embody it in the clause in some other form at a subsequent stage of the Bill. The full exercise of the autocratic power of the county council in purely rural parishes was admirable and should not be interfered with in any way, but nearly every county council had within its area towns more or less considerable in size. In many of these places there had been for a generation school boards of the most efficient type, which had carried out all the expenditure incidental to the provision of elementary school accommodation. He contended that the urban and the rural areas were totally distinct types, and as one who approved of the principle of elasticity, he maintained that some freedom ought to be given to county councils to form the delegation of their work on different lines, suited to the requirements of the urban and the rural areas. In his own constituency there were three towns—one above the population standard of the Act of 1902, and the other two slightly below that standard. In all three there had been admirable school boards which had provided those towns with some of the most splendid schools they could see in any large town. The largest of these towns, of course, was autonomous in matters of education, while the other two had been restricted to the most trivial powers of management. The opinion of those interested in education in such towns was practically unanimous that something like the school board powers should be restored by delegation under this Bill. His plea was a moderate one, and it was fully consistent with the principle of the clause, namely, that there should be absolute elasticity to the county councils to deal at their own discretion with each delegation area on the lines peculiar and proper to itself. He did not challenge in the slightest degree the retention of the control of capital expenditure in the hands of the county council, but he did say that it was not unreasonable that the bodies to whom duties were delegated should have certain powers as to the provision of school accommodation subject to the control and approval of the county council of any proposal involving the expenditure of money as indicated in the Amendment. He did not see why this provision should, contrary to the spirit of the clause, deny to the county council a free hand to give the local bodies power to deal with these matters involving expenditure within certain specified limits. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'school,' insert the words 'except where the county council has authorised any proposal and estimate relating thereto.'"—(*Mr. Channing.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LOUGH said that all that the hon. Gentleman asked for was provided for in Clause 2, and therefore the Amendment was quite unnecessary. It was necessary that the county councils should keep all matters of expenditure in their own hands.

*MR. CHANNING said he hoped that the Government in working out their scheme of delegation would have regard to the powers of delegation which should be given to the old school board towns which were well qualified to discharge them. Unless that were done irritation would be sure to arise.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON, said that as the clause stood, the delegated authority had no power to incur capital or any other expenditure. But it was desirable that they should have an initiative in bringing before the attention of the local education authority the necessity of certain alterations nd improvements. Unless that were done the local education authority would lose touch with the minor authorities; and he thought the hon. Member for Northamptonshire East was well advised in bringing forward his Amendment.

*MR. ADKINS said that surely there was no necessity for these minor bodies to have more than powers of suggestion or recommendation. The county councils might be entrusted to draw up schemes for all the districts in their county.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said that in the case where a county council approved of an estimated expenditure of the minor authority, and the minor authority exceeded the estimate and had no power to incur that expenditure, who was to pay it?

MR. LOUGH said that if the local authority accepted the estimate he did not see why the delegated powers should not include the powers of mediation.

Amendment negatived.

*MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) in moving to leave out the words "engagement, dismissal and," said that he was very anxious that this devolution clause should be carried and become really effective. The county councils had done much to add to the efficiency of education in their areas. They had improved the condition of the teachers, had increased the attendance of children in the schools, and had made large economies in the purchase of stores; but when the local managers now came to meet together they found that they had practically nothing to do. This had killed local interest in the schools. It was most necessary to restore that interest so as to get the hearty co-operation of all in improving the schools. To get this some real power must be given to the local managers. He agreed that Parliament should say, for instance, that the salaries of the teachers should be decided by the central authority, but not that the local managers should have no power or duty in regard to the engagement or dismissal of the teachers. They ought at least to be able to nominate or recommend. He thought it would be unwise to tie the hands of the authorities in that respect. The councils would use their common sense and local knowledge in order to make the education system in their area effective if they were trusted as to what powers should be devolved.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 12, to leave out the words 'engagement, dismissal, and:'"—(*Mr. Everett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

DR. MACNAMARA said that his hon. friend was now proposing to hand over the engagement and dismissal of the teachers to the delegation authority —which might be only a parish council— leaving the question of the salaries to be dealt with by the county council. They all desired some selection, some voice in weeding out those teachers who were not likely to be successful. But his hon. friend would see that the county councils had still enormous powers outside the scheme, and all that this Amendment did was to give new powers as to the appointment and dismissal of teachers. Outside the scheme there would be opportunity to give powers of full selection. If the hon. Gentleman would look at the matter in that light he would see there was no necessity for the Amendment. They would still remain as they were now, but they could not be put into this scheme. He therefore hoped he would withdraw the Amendment.

MR. LOUGH also appealed to the hon. Gentleman not to press the Amendment. The provision with regard to the teachers had been fully discussed and considered, and these three words, "engagement, dismissal, and salary," must, so far as the Government was concerned, remain in the Bill.

*Mr. LANE-FOX said he did not quite understand what the Parliamentary Secretary meant by what he had just said. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would give some further explanation. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had spoken as if the Act of 1902 gave sufficient powers of delegation in this matter. If that was so, what was the use of this section at all? He was strongly in favour of the Amendment, because he believed it would bring a question of great interest into the scope of these delegation bodies. He was perfectly convinced that this was the kind of duty which they wanted delegated to them. Up to now they had been consultative bodies. Their opinion had been taken, but they had no initiative. He did not wish that the fixing of the salaries should be delegated; what he wanted to see done, if possible, was the parents brought into closer touch with the teachers, and that they should be made to feel that they had some voice in their selection. It was quite possible to safeguard the position of the teachers against injustice. It seemed to him that the Amendment could safely be incorporated in the Bill, and he hoped the hon. Member would not yield to the pressing invitations which had been extended to him to withdraw it.

Mr. SILCOCK (Somersetshire, Wells) said he did not wish to give the power entirely into the hands of the delegation bodies, but these words would show they had nothing to do with the engagement of teachers. He would suggest that they would take out these words and put in the words, "no power to dismiss or alter salaries." By this means the words which the Parliamentary Secretary suggested must remain in the Bill were retained, but at the same time it was made clear that the delegation body must have something to say with regard to the engagement, dismissal and the fixing of the salaries, although they had not the full power.

Viscount MORPETH thought the suggestion of the hon. Member went some way to meet the difficulty. The statement of the Parliamentary Secretary was simply amazing. Here was a question of the greatest importance, and all the hon. Gentleman said was that it had been well and carefully considered! When and how was it carefully considered, and by whom? He objected to this scheme of delegation, because trifling things that were not asked for were delegated to these bodies, and the things which they should have in their hands were not. He did not think they should have the engagement and dismissal of the teachers, but he thought they were entitled to have some voice in choosing who the teacher should be. He agreed that the county councils should have a supervising power, and that there should be an appeal from the delegation area to the county council in case of dismissal. But subject to the supervision over the appointment of a teacher and the appeal in case of dismissal he thought the people were entitled to have some voice in the appointment of the person who was to teach their children. This was the kernel of the whole difficulty.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) thought the Committee should consider the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Wells Division. The council of the delegated areas were the school owners and parents should have full powers of supervision of discipline, so to speak, over the teacher. The minor councils should have power to recommend dismissal when occasion justified it. They should have no power to engage. Engagement should be by the county council. They should have no power of dismissal. The dismissal should be by the county council, and the actual form of fixing salaries for teachers should remain with the county council. He supported the Amendment.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON made an appeal to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education to accept the alteration. He would like to know what were the large powers which the county councils had outside this scheme to which the hon. Member for North Camberwell referred. Beyond the power to form an education committee and of that committee to form sub-committees under the schedule of the Act of 1902, he knew of no powers of delegation which the county council had. The Parliamentary Secretary had told them that these words were arrived at after full and careful consideration, and a good deal of give and take on both sides. He could not understand when this full consideration took place, seeing that barely a week ago they were discussing an entirely different clause. Although the Committee were unanimous in their desire that some form of delegation should take place they were also unanimous that in one matter of much importance the value of this delegation should not be destroyed by the limitations imposed by the Government. This clause as it stood practically forbade delegation of any kind with regard to the dismissal and appointment of teachers. He thought that the fixing of the salary should be a matter for the local education authority, but that the people should have some voice in the appointment and dismissal of the teacher, so as to prevent such a thing as the organising secretary finding a teacher, and dumping him down in the school without any reference to the local authority.

MR. LOUGH said that the matter had been discussed between the Board of Education and the local authorities, and the give and take must be between the local education authority and the local area. The consideration of this matter had been taking place for days and weeks past, and most of that consideration had been directed to this very question connected with the teachers. There seemed to be practical unanimity with regard to the matter, and, as his right hon. friend explained earlier in the evening, the Government wished as far as possible to create some interest in the appointment and selection of teachers. If the hon. Gentleman behind him would withdraw the Amendment, he would be prepared to accept the words suggested by the hon. Member for the Wells Division—namely, "and no power to engage, dismiss, or fix the salaries of teachers."

*MR. CHEETHAM (Stalybridge) desired to point out to the Parliamentary Secretary that in the Cheshire scheme the Cheshire Council practically left the whole matter to the delegation authority; he wanted to know whether under this Bill the Cheshire County Council would be placed in a worse position in this respect than as at present. He would like to have a positive assurance that councils in the position of the Cheshire County Council would be safeguarded against any prejudicial effect upon the working of their systems of delegation that might be likely to result from the operations of this clause.

MR. CAVE said that as he understood, the proposal was to withdraw the Amendment now under discussion, in order that by a subsequent Amendment the words of the clause which prevented an authority from delegating any power or duty in connection with the engagement and dismissal of teachers might be struck out, and there might be substituted words forbidding the authority to delegate the power to engage or dismiss the teachers. He did not think that the words so proposed to be substituted would be a substantial improvement on the words of the clause, and he proposed that the Amendment now under discussion should be adopted. If the Amendment now before the Committee were accepted he would suggest the addition of the following words at the end, "And it may be a condition of any such scheme of delegation that the engagement or dismissal of teachers shall be subject to the approval of the local education authority."

LORD BALCARRES hoped the Government would not accept these words. He thought the limitation proposed by the clause was far too narrow. The delegation authority should have no power over the teachers.

DR. MACNAMARA thought it was desirable that the final confirmation of the appointment or dismissal of a teacher should rest with the county authority. If the words suggested by the hon. Member for the Wells Division were adoped, it would still be competent for the delegation authority to select teachers and send them up to the county authority for appointment.

LORD R. CECIL thought it was essential that some voice in the engagement and dismissal of teachers should be given to the delegation authority, If the words suggested by the hon. Member for the Wells Division were adopted, the county councils would conclude that they had no power to authorise the minor authorities to select teachers and send them up for appointment. He thought the Amendment suggested by his hon. friend the Member for Kingston met the case.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that the President of the Board of Education, who had just returned to the House, should know the course of the debate, and that the Committee plainly wished that power should be given to the local education authority to delegate to a minor authority some share in the selection of the teacher and his dismissal. There was no desire that this should be a final voice, but it was important that, while securing this latter point, words should not be used which might lead local authorities to suppose that they were bound to withdraw their whole subject from the delegation areas.

*Mr. ADKINS said that apparently the noble Lord wanted to put this power in the hands of the managers. What the supporters of the Government wanted was to secure the absolute freedom of each county council within wide limits. He hoped the Committee would adopt either one or the other of the Motions before the House. The hon. Member for the Oswestry Division had said that if they desired to give greater freedom to the local authority they could not support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kingston. He agreed; for that Amendment took out of the hands of the local authority any power whatsoever to put into their scheme any form of delegation to the minor authority of selection in the case of the engagement or dismissal of teachers. He himself, like his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell, was desirous of giving full power to the county council, and he hoped this clause would be left as it was with the words of his hon. friend the Member for Wells to be inserted on Report. They all wanted the same thing—they all wanted power of selection.

Mr. EVERETT asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Leave to withdraw refused.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he was sure the Committee would be able to come to some agreement on the point. Perhaps the word "finally" might be inserted after the words "power to meet the situation." He hoped his hon. friend would be allowed to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. BIRRELL said he gathered that the words as they stood in the clause went too far, inasmuch as they would prohibit the delegation by the county council to these delegation bodies of powers which certainly all desired that they should have of election of teachers. They wished to find a form of words which would enable the county council to leave a wide discretion to the minor body, short of the final appointment, selection, dismissal, and fixing of the salary of the teacher. He hoped that the Committee would allow the Amendment to be withdrawn in favour of that standing in the name of the hon. Member for the Wells Division of Somerest.

*The CHAIRMAN said he did his best to enable that to be done, but it was objected to, and now the Question must be put.

*Mr. CAVE said that the right thing to do was to allow the local body actually to choose and appoint the teacher, subject to approval by the higher authority. That was the only way to satisfy the minor authorities. What he desired was that, while the education authority should reserve the question of salaries, it should leave the appointment and dismissal of teachers to the delegation authority, subject to its own confirmation. He was quite willing, if the Amendment now under discussion were adopted, to move at the proper time the Amendment standing in his name which required such confirmation to be obtained.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) hoped the Committee would adhere to the words in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wells. He thought it was far better that the minor authority should make a selection of two or three names, from which the final selection should be made by the local education authority. He understood that would be secured by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wells, which he hoped would be put.

*The CHAIRMAN said it could not now be put, because hon. Members had objected to the withdrawal of the Amendment now under discussion.

Mr. LOUGH said the matter now seemed to be one for the Report stage, and if convenient the Government would agree that the Amendment before the Committee should be negatived, and they would introduce the words "no power to engage, dismiss, or fix the salaries of teachers" on the Report stage.

Mr. SILCOCK asked whether if the present Amendment were withdrawn he might move the Amendment to which reference had been made in the discussion.

*The CHAIRMAN said the hon. Gentleman would not be in order. The Question before the Committee must be decided in the affirmative or negative, and in either case the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wells went back to a point before the Amendment now under discussion.

Lord BALCARRES said he was strongly in favour of the clause as it stood in regard to this point. Nothing more dangerous could be introduced than the power of provisional dismissal of a teacher by a subordinate body.

*Mr. TALBOT (Oxford University) thought the Minister for Education might help the Committee a little more in this matter than he had. He supported the Amendment. At the present time in the rural districts the local managers practically appointed the teacher, and the central authority confirmed the appointment. If there were any case in which the local managers did not do their duty the central authority reserved their power of interference, but they naturally thought that those on the spot knew the needs of the place. That was the condition of things in the part of the country in which he lived, and he had the experience of a local manager, as well as of a member of the county education committee, and he hoped it would long continue, for there was no friction whatsoever.

Mr. BIRRELL said that the best thing the Committee could do would be to leave the words as they were. On Report an Amendment would be introduced to prevent the words as they stood from limiting the powers of the county council. He did not want to limit the powers of the county council, and wished to make it perfectly clear that the council could delegate certain rights and privileges in connection with the selection of teachers. He therefore thought the words should stand, and if, upon further consideration, other words should seem more clearly to declare the object, he would suggest them on Report.

Mr. LANE-FOX supported the Amendment to leave out the words "engagement, dismissal, and." He had an Amendment to the same effect on the Paper, and he did not move it because he understood that the hon. Member for Woodbridge was going to move a similar Amendment, and he hoped the hon. Member would do what he intended to do and stand by what he had said, namely, that the initiative in choosing teachers should come from the local authority. He should certainly object to the Amendment being withdrawn.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 333; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 232).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert

Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J. (S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler,Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H.(Rochester)
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras, E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN. Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhmpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Royers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.

Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hn. C.H.W.(Hull, W.)
Wilson,Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(Norfolk,Mid)
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hn. Guy (Winchester)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cochrane,Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M‘Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Everett and Mr. Lane-Fox.

*Mr. CHEETHAM moved to substitute "may" for "shall" in line 17 in order that the county council might have full discretion either to enforce or not to enforce financial responsibility upon a local representative body to whom powers and duties were delegated in respect of the expenses of carrying out the powers and duties delegated. The County Council of Cheshire were of opinion that the enforcement of this responsibity would lead to complications in the rating of the county which would be out of all proportion to the advantages gained.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 17, to leave out the word 'shall' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. Cheetham.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the proposed new clause."

Mr. LOUGH said it was impossible to accept this Amendment. The effect of it would be to make the financial responsibility of the area optional instead of compulsory. The essence of the scheme was that there must be some financial responsibility in the local areas to which these powers were delegated. They must stick fast to the principle embodied in the clause that areas incurring any outlay could not escape their responsibility.

MR. CHEETHAM asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. LANE-FOX moved to leave out the words "or some proportion" in lines 18 and 19. He was encouraged to hope that this Amendment would receive some support from the Parliamentary Secretary, who had just stated that each area must have financial responsibility. The object of the Amendment was to secure that the whole amount of the expenditure incurred in each area should fall on that area, and leave no loophole by which the expenditure of the more expensive areas could be saddled on the poorer ones. This could only be done by insisting on each area being self-sufficient.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In lines 18 and 19 leave out the words 'or some proportion.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

MR. LOUGH said the hon. Member would see that such a great change in the scheme of the clause could hardly be accepted by the Government without some substantial reason. As the Bill was drawn it left discretion to the county council to charge the whole or some portion of the expenditure on the area. The Amendment would press very hardly on the smaller area, and altogether he thought that the scheme in the clause was much better than that proposed in the Amendment.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON thought that the Parliamentary Secretary scarcely understood the argument of the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment or he would have paid more attention to it. He thought that the Government should pay some attention to the financial position of the rural areas and try to arrive at some equitable adjustment of responsibility.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said that as representing a rural area he objected to the clause as it stood. It seemed to him that it would be scandalous, if the county council delegated its powers to a small area, that the other areas should have to pay for all the expenditure that had been incurred in that area. The Act of 1902 had raised the rates to a considerable extent in many places, and he was certain that if it were an open question to the county council to have power to delegate their powers to minor authorities, the Education Act would be more unpopular than ever. The object of the clause was that all the other areas should have to pay for the expenses incurred by one area over which they had no control.

MR. LOUGH said that the noble Lord did not seem to understand the clause, which left it to the option of the county council to charge the whole cost of expenditure incurred to the particular area benefitted.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) thought that the hon. Member had hardly grasped the objection which had been taken by the noble Lord. He seemed to think that one local authority ought to be able to incur expense, and that the other local authority should bear it. All that the Amendment asked was that those who created the expense should be asked to bear it. The hon. Gentleman might shake his head, but he said most emphatically that the delegation authority might create certain expenses which the other authorities would have to bear. This was a most important matter, and all they could do was to debate it upon its merits, because the Government, by putting on the Closure, had not allowed a single clause proposed by an independent Member to be discussed.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY said that the Members representing urban districts in a county council might be extravagant in the matter of education. That had happened under the Act of 1902, and it would be worse under the proposed Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman. His objection might be removed if the right hon. Gentleman were to leave out the words "in some proportion."

MR. HICKS-BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) reminded the hon. Gentleman that the gentlemen who represented the urban parts of a county council were more frequent in their attendance at the meetings, because of their facilities in getting to the county town, compared with the representatives from the rural districts.

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words 'or some proportion' stand part of the proposed new clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 371; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 233.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clyens, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn,, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Halsam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert

Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Lever, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenney)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip

O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'hampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr;
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E.(Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert N.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson, SirG,Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleto,n David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.

Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk,Mid.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J.T.(Huddr'sfd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. SirH
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George

Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry. N,
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon.Sir Edward H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healey, Timothy Michael
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thomson, W.Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Helmsley and Mr. Lane-Fox.

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of the Government new clauses and of the schedules to the Bill, and the Question necessary to bring to a conclusion the Committee stage of the Bill.

Question put, "That the clause (Schemes with reference to delegation) be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 365; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 234.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex,Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A.(Inverness Burghs.)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon, Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John, (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T. F.(Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)

Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)

Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard

White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. Huddersf'd.
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn. Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt.Hon. Victor C. W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount

Dixon, Sir Daniel
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S.Edm's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W. Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.

Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt.Hn. J.G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Castlereagh and Mr. F. E. Smith.

Another new clause (Power to require use of schoolhouse for educational purposes out of school hours)—(*Mr. Birrell,*)—brought up, and read the first and second time.

Question put, "That the clause be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 370; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 235.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.

Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp. E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (Tower H'ml'ts, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bolton, T D. (Derbyshire, N.E)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major A. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil G. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.. S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, B. Wateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirrall)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick, A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, Jame

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Phillipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhamp'n
Richardson, A.

Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbigh-sh).
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)

Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir J. L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, J. (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfork)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hick
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Du Cros, Harvey

Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)

Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesball
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Another new clause (Allowance to teachers losing employment in consequence of this Act)—(*Mr. Birrell,*)—brought up, and added to the Bill.

Second schedule:—

Amendments made.

Question put, "That the schedule, as amended, be the schedule of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 359; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 236.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Chas. P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, J. A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. W. (Devonport
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hallam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson

Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon. S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'hs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. L. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, Jas. (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, J. (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk Mid.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'rsfi'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. H. O.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh H.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred D.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
King, Sir H. Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report the Bill as amended, to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 303; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 237.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson,Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(Southampt'n
Philipps,J.Wynford Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wason,Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hn. C.H.W.(Hull, W.)

Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Dixon, Sir Daniel
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur

Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrington, Timothy
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)

Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 317.]

REVENUE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.), in moving the Second Reading, called attention to the fact that from beginning to end the Bill was entirely non-controversial and non-party. It was almost in its entire provisions the identical Bill which was introduced last year by hon. Gentlemen opposite. There were one or two new clauses, the reasons for the introduction of which he thought it would be satisfactory to the House that he should explain.

The main provisions of the Bill related to industrial alcohol, and all the provisions related to different matters which were required for the facilitation of the trade and manufacture or business of the country. It was, therefore, he thought the House would agree, most desirable that the Bill should be passed at the earliest possible moment. As the House knew, industrial alcohol was very largely used in manufacture. It entered as an ingredient into a great variety of substances. It was used in varnish, in soap, in powder, in smokeless powder and other explosives, in chemicals, in celluloid, in pegamoid, in hat-making, in linoleum, and in an infinite variety of other articles which hon. Gentlemen who were interested would find in the minutes of the evidence given before the Industrial Alcohol Committee. An article of that kind, hon. Gentlemen would concede, should be produced, in order to assist our manufactures, at the cheapest possible price. Its main ingredient, however, was plain spirit, and plain spirit was subject to a very heavy excise duty. He believed the cost of the article free of duty would be about 1s. 6d. a gallon, but the duty itself was 11s. a gallon. Where so heavy a duty as that existed it was obvious that the Revenue was bound, for its own protection, to insist upon very strict regulations in regard to the distillation of spirit. Those regulations, quite apart from the operation of the duty itself, involved expense upon the distiller, and as a result of that expense the distiller was bound to sell his pure spirit to the methylator at a higher price than if no such regulations existed. All the articles which were manufactured by the use of methylated spirit were increased in price in consequence of the added price put upon the industrial alcohol, the raw material, and the article which came into this country from foreign countries, where no similar restrictions existed, got the benefit of the cheaper methylated spirit. They consequently, in competition with our goods, had an advantage due solely to the Excise restrictions placed upon the distillation of methylated spirits in this country. The increased price caused by those restrictions it was not easy to estimate, but at the present moment on the import of plain spirit the cost of these restrictions was estimated at 3d. per gallon. It was proposed to remove the grievance which British manufacturers now suffered in consequence of the Excise restrictions on the distillation of spirit, by giving them a similar allowance of 3d. per gallon in the case of industrial alcohol. That was the first sub-section in the first clause. But they had a second grievance. Industrial alcohol, speaking generally, consisted of pure plain spirit mixed with wood naptha. The alcohol, under the old regulations governing the manufacture of industrial alcohol, would have one-ninth of the wood naphtha in it. Wood naphtha was dearer than the spirit, and by being mixed with the spirit rendered it less useful for purposes of manufacture. It would be seen therefore that it would be a great advantage if the quantity of wood naphtha could be reduced. This grievance of the manufacturer was removed by the third subsection of the clause, under which the proportion of wood naphtha was reduced from one-ninth to one-nineteenth. And then there was a third grievance which arose in the case of pure alcohol. Where pure alcohol was used in manufacture, for the protection of the Revenue it was necessary that an Excise Officer should attend in order to supervise the process of manufacture. Under Section 8 of the Finance Act, 1902, which facilitated the use of pure spirit in manufacture, the cost of his attendance had to be borne by the manufacturer. It was now proposed that that cost should be borne by the Revenue. Thus it was that by subsections, (1), (3) and (4) of the first clause of the Bill the main grievances of the manufacturers who used industrial alcohol for their own purposes were removed. Sub-section (2) of Clause 1 dealt with alcohol, and removed the surtax which was now imposed upon foreign imported alcohol. There were no Excise restrictions upon its manufacture in this country, and consequently the general ground upon which the surtax was imposed upon foreign importation did not exist. Therefore, it was considered proper that it should be taken off. Sub-section (5) dealt with mineralised methylated spirits—that was, the ordinary methylated spirit of commerce. It contained at the present moment one-ninth of wood-naphtha, and had added to that ·375 of petroleum. The sub-section permitted the retailer to receive from another retailer fifty gallons at a time, and the maximum quantity which the retailer would sell to or for the use of any one person at a time was one gallon. It had been found that the present restrictions were frequently unduly severe on the retailer, and this sub-section also was devised solely in the interests of the trade. Clause 2 was subsidiary to the main purpose of Clause 1. It prohibited a retailer from receiving industrial methylated spirit, that was a pure spirit plus one-nineteenth wood naphtha, and provided machinery for enforcing the prohibition. Sub-section (6) gave power to the Commissioners to add to the sulphuric ether and chloroform, things which were already allowed to be prepared from methylated spirit, similar preparations used for like purposes. He only mentioned these facts—which were very complicated, and could be entered into in detail in Committee—but it was desirable to explain the general purpose of this first clause. Clause 3, like Clause 2, was subsidiary to Clause 1. Clause 4 was the definition clause, and related to a small matter in which industrial alcohol was used for purposes of manufacture. Clause 5 assimilated the law as regards saccharine to the law as it already existed in regard to sugar, tobacco, and other articles on which there were duties.

SIR E. CARSON: asked what was the object of assimilating the law.

MR. McKENNA: Because there was a duty on saccharine, as there was a duty on sugar, tobacco, and tea; and it was giving the same powers in regard to the importation of saccharine as now existed in regard to the importation of sugar and other articles. There were certain powers of summary jurisdiction possessed by the magistrates in regard to other articles, and it was proposed to give the same powers in regard to saccharine. Clause 6 allowed tobacco to be imported in a ship of 120 tons burden. Clause 7, which was a more important clause than the machinery clause, related to a question which had arisen in regard to the use of foreign grape "must" in the manufacture of British wines. It was alleged that British wines so manufactured were frequently used as the basis of wines which were passed off as foreign wines, and ought to be subject to the usual duty. It was proposed under this Bill to put the manufacturers of British wines under observation. It was proposed that they should be registered, and that they should take out a licence—the duty was only small, it was not a revenue matter—but the opportunity was taken under this Bill of seeing whether the charges made were in any way justified, and—in a word — opportunities were given of determining hereafter how the grievance —if the grievance existed—could be dealt with. Clause 8 was merely the Amendment of a verbal slip, and Clause 9 provided for a uniform duty on awards instead of a duty on the amount of the claim. It was considered on the whole that it was more favourable to the suitors to deal with it in that way. Clause 10, the new clause, dealt with Treasury Bills. Under the Treasury Bills Act of 1877 the Treasury had power to raise money by the issue of Bills. Those Bills were limited to one year, and must be renewed within the year in which they expired. Bills which expired in the last quarter of the financial year had to be renewed before March 31st of that year, or the whole of the existing power of the Treasury ceased. During that period the income-tax was mainly collected, and the result was that there was usually a large Exchequer balance at the Bank. The City was frequently amused at the spectacle, not knowing the reason for it, of the Treasury going into the market and borrowing money on Treasury Bills at the very moment when they had a superabundance of balance at the Bank. The City pointed out that this must be a loss to the Exchequer, because they paid interest on the Treasury Bills and did not get interest on their bank balance. It was also complained that the Treasury were withdrawing from the market money which might be used to better advantage if left in the possession of the City for the purposes of trade. The clause now introduced proposed to give a discretion to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to renew a Bill which expired in the last quarter of the year, but to hold it over until the next succeeding quarter. He need not exercise that discretion, but at any rate when he had already swollen balances at the bank at the end of February or in March, he would have the power not to renew his Treasury Bill, then and there, but could wait till the following April or May, when his balance was once again reduced, in order to borrow the money which he required. That was the meaning of the first part of Clause 10. Sub-section (2) of that clause was somewhat of a technical character. The Bank of England was now paid £200 for every million pounds outstanding at the close of the financial year. When that arrangement was entered into the value of the Treasury Bills was such that the Bank of England was sure to be paid for all the Treasury Bills in the course of the year. But in 1902 power was taken to raise money on Treasury Bills for the purposes of Ways and Means, and the Bills thus raised were paid off in the year. As a consequence they were not outstanding on March 31st, and the Bank of England which had all the trouble, got no payment. That grievance was to a certain extent remedied by paying a larger amount of interest on their deficiency at the Bank, but the House would readily perceive that by giving the Chancellor of the Exchequer powers not to renew his Bills before March 31st, it would add to the grievance, because there would be less Bills outstanding on March 31st. Power was consequently taken in sub-clause (2) to remunerate the Bank at a fair scale on the total amount of Bills issued in the year. Clause 11 was an administrative matter, pure and simple, introduced for the purpose of alleviating the difficulties which sometimes arose owing to the great increase of the work of the Income Tax Commissioners, for which under the present laws their clerks were not allowed to receive any additional pay. Clause 12 dealt with a Scottish matter which he would prefer should be left to the Secretary for Scotland, and Clause 13 related to the commencement and short title. He had now been through every clause of the Bill, which the House would agree was a wholly uncontroversial measure. He hoped the House would not only give a Second Reading to the Bill, but when they reached the other stages allow the Bill to proceed as quickly as possible in order that it might be passed in the general interests of the trade of the country.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) hoped he might be allowed to congratulate the hon. Gentleman not only on the very clear and lucid manner in which he had explained the Bill to the House, but also on the very important discovery he had made since transferring himself from the Opposition side to the Treasury Bench. The Government of which he (Mr. Cavendish) had the honour of being a Member introduced a measure almost identical word for word with the present Bill, and he had a vivid recollection of the time when the late Government were not allowed to pass that Bill which they were now told was so urgent and necessary for the manufactures and trade of the country. Speaking for his hon. friends and himself, he could say that they were not prepared to stand against the interests of the manufacturers and traders of this country, and anything they could do to accelerate a Bill which they knew had been most unnecessarily delayed during the last two or three years, they would do their best to accomplish. After the lucid manner in which the Financial Secretary of the Treasury had explained the clauses of the Bill, it was unnecessary for him to stand between the House and the next subject. With regard to Clause 11, however, certain of his hon. friends were anxious for a rather fuller explanation than the hon. Gentleman had given. Speaking on behalf of his hon. friends on the Opposition side they welcomed the Bill, their only regret being that owing to various circumstances the traders and manufacturers of the country had not already had the advantage of the measure.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he did not in the least desire to interfere with the passing of this Bill, but he wanted to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he could take this opportunity to explain the attitude of the Treasury in relation to the subject of tobacco-growing in Ireland. The subject was discussed in another place yesterday afternoon. He listened to the debate at the Bar, and he must say that he did not think the matter was very fully discussed. He was not able to say anything, of course, and therefore he took the first opportunity he had of asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer for his views on the matter.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) said the Financial Secretary had made the extraordinary statement that the Government got no interest on their bank balances. They could get interest on balances from every other bank in the country except the Bank of England from day to day, and he could get it from the Bank of England. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer explain why the Government had been such noodles that they did not get interest on bank balances as other people did.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton, said the Financial Secretary had urged the House to agree to the Bill because it had been proposed by the late Government. That had been the kind of speech the Secretary of the Treasury had made on almost every Bill which he had presented to the House. It was remarkable, because he had been placed in the office he so honourably filled in order that he might reverse the policy of the late Government. Therefore, to appeal to Members on the Opposition side for their support of a policy to oppose which he had obtained office, was not, in his opinion, the best way to gain support. It was remarkable also that, speaking on behalf of a Liberal Government, he had urged the passing of this Bill, because it would cheapen the cost of alcohol—alcohol which for the past twenty-five years had been to the Liberal Party an absolute bogey, and in regard to which they had been ready to inflict the greatest injustice upon those who had been engaged in "the trade." It was a sorry thing that the Liberal Party should plead as the main reason why the Bill should be passed that it would assist the sale of alcohol. In answer to that, it might be said that the Bill referred to alcohol which was not drunk; but they would take no drastic measures under this Bill to deal with so-called British wines. Why should not these bogus beverages come under the same law as governed all other traders in alcoholic drink? He could not join in the pæan of praise of his hon. friend on the Front Bench. It was customary for such speeches to pass from one front Bench to the other, and it was a matter which did not concern hon. Members in the House who did not sit on the Front Benches. Their business was to see that freedom of opinion and independence of action should have a fair chance in the House, and just because this Bill had been brought in by the last Government was no reason why they should accept it—particularly when the Secretary to the Treasury had only told the half-truth—he did not mean it in any offensive way. His hon. friend had referred to certain clauses which were novel and far-reaching in character, and which no doubt were calculated to inflict a grave injustice upon a large class of loyal and devoted public servants. Under Clause 11 the Government would commit a breach of faith with the officials of the Land Tax Commissioners. Under Acts passed some years ago it was decreed that if there were any alteration in the conditions of the service they should be entitled to compensation. Why should the clerks of the Land Commissioners be singled out for unfair treatment in that way? By this Bill the House of Commons was asked to destroy rights of these men which had been recognised since 1842, and to inflict an injustice on a most efficient body of men who had undertaken certain financial and other responsibilities because they had faith in the pledge of Parliament that they would not be disturbed, and that they could count on the emoluments attached to their office. The reason why this Bill had a sinister purpose was that it gave to the Board of Inland Revenue absolute discretion either to alter by reduction or increase the areas in which these officials now acted. He believed that the real departmental fact in connection with the whole of this matter was that the Board of Inland Revenue, having a large number of young officials awaiting promotion, wished to oust the men now occupying these offices. He would deal further with this matter when the Bill reached the Committee stage.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he did not understand this Bill. He supposed one reason why it was so unintelligible was that it was a heritage from the Tory Party. It was an anti-Free Trade Bill. It was a Bill for protection, and he wished it to be distinctly understood that he was entirely in favour of it. This Bill was a measure of protection for British manufacturers as against foreigners. [Cries of "No."] He would demonstrate it. In the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposals with regard to tobacco, the small benefit which the manufacturers enjoyed under previous legislation was swept away in the sacred name of free trade. Every British manufacturer—and that included Irish manufacturers—got hitherto a drawback of 3d. per gallon on all spirits sent out. That was supposed to make up for the heavy restrictions placed on British and Irish distillers by Treasury supervision. They were placed at an enormous disadvantage as compared with foreign manufacturers who made spirits from potatoes. It was perfectly right that the British Government should give that drawback, but what did this Bill do? He had read the first clause four times, and, as he understood it, instead of saying that the distiller of methylated spirits should get a drawback of 3d. as had been the practice hitherto, it said that in future it should go to the rectifier. That was not put in plain language, but in a sort of marmalade of the English tongue which it was almost impossible to decipher. It amounted to what he had said. By this means the Government proposed a measure of protection. He had no doubt they would hear now, or in Committee, the Government defence for what was really a measure of protection. He gladly welcomed the measure, but, at all events, the cant of free trade in this respect disappeared in the first clause of the Bill. When the Bill went into Committee he would watch this provision most carefully. Unless the impression was removed, he would maintain that this was a measure of pure and simple protection which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had adopted from the Tory Party. A far more important clause in the Bill was that which placed restrictions on the makers of British wines. He had again and again during the session put Questions to the right hon. Gentleman with respect to the frauds on the consumers that were being connived at by the Revenue. It was an extraordinary thing that the Revenue Department of this country should act the part of the stony step-mother to the inhabitants of the country from whom the revenue was drawn. Instead of seeing that what they taxed was honest stuff, they took up the position of saying, "We do not care what it is; we do not care whose stomach it destroys, so long as we get the revenue." There should be no manufacture of British wines. There might be no manufactures on which to employ this alcohol and no use for it except to perpetrate a fraud on the public. Therefore, he welcomed the fact that they were putting in this clause for the first time. It was said that currants introduced from Greece were sent through the mill and afterwards appeared as the finest Bordeaux wine; and that brandy was imported from Norway where never a grape vine grew. Nobody expected that an Amendment of the Stamp Duty Act would touch those practices.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) thought that the Bill did not go far enough. The alcohol produced in Germany for motor and other purposes was sold at very moderate prices; but in this country the law prevented manufacturers from employing alcohol for all these purposes. It appeared to him that they ought rather to do all they could to encourage the production of alcohol for these industrial enterprises. In Germany the price of alcohol was 9d. per gallon, whereas in this country it was 1s. 3d. The Report of the Alcohol Committee said that this country ought to be in advance of other countries in the production of alcohol for industrial purposes; but he had a letter from a manufacturer which said that this Bill would not give manufacturers any advantage, although alcohol could be produced from paper, straw, and other waste substances.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said he could assure hon. Members on both sides of the House that the motive of the Bill was entirely in the interests of the trade of the country, while conserving the interests of the Revenue. There was no protection in any shape or form in the clauses of the Bill. This measure would put foreign alcohol and domestic alcohol on exactly the same footing. As regarded British wines, as to which the hon. Member had used some strong expressions, he was sorry to find he must associate himself with them. Their object in proposing the licence duty was to bring this trade under Excise supervision, so that they might determine how far the allegations which were made were true, and whether the imported "must" which came from other countries was really being used to palm off English wines as foreign wines. If this proved to be the case they hoped to bring all these various concoctions under the law as it existed. They would no longer be given any preference in their competition, and they would not pass untaxed in comparison with imported articles. This reform, which was very much needed, would be in consonance with justice and expediency, and they were quite right to slip it into a Bill of this sort when they had the chance. He hoped, therefore, that the House would agree to a Bill which was urgently needed in the interests of the general trade of the country. As to the question of tobacco-growing in Ireland raised by the hon. Member for East Clare, he had already shown great sympathy in regard to it, and would continue to do so. It was not, however, germane to the question before the House. His hon. friend the Member for Sutherland said that the Government should obtain interest on their current balance at the Bank. The hon. Member was a very lucky man if he got interest at his bank upon his current account.

MR. MORTON said that his bank was giving such interest now.

*MR. ASQUITH: What bank?

MR. MORTON: I am not obliged to tell you.

*MR. ASQUITH said that perhaps the hon. Member would communicate with him privately, as he should like to know a man who got interest upon his current account from a London banker.

MR. MORTON said he could get it now, calculated every twenty-four hours at one per cent. below the bank rate on any amount above £5,000.

*MR. ASQUITH was glad to hear it. If the hon. Gentleman would communicate with him, he would be glad to transfer his account to such a bank. He did not think the Treasury was badly treated.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

Order for Third Reading, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) wished to call the attention of the House to the very extraordinary provisions of the Bill. Three classes of people were affected by it, the manufacturer and sellers of fertilisers and feeding stuffs, the Board of Agriculture, and the officials who acted under the directions of that authority. It seemed to him, after giving the best consideration he could to the subject, that it inflicted a real and serious injury upon the manufacturers and the sellers, and also the buyers, and the only people who reaped any advantage from it were the officials of the Board of Agriculture and the Board itself. The manufacture of fertilisers and feeding stuffs was an enormous and prosperous industry in which large numbers of men were employed, and he could not see why it should be singled out for this particular kind of legislation. No reasons were given for this policy. The Bill provided that if a person made or sold for use as a fertiliser or feeding stuff any preparation which he might make and which had been subjected to any artificial process, he should give to the purchaser, whether he demanded it or not, the chemical constituents of his preparation. To that there might not be so much objection, but the Bill laid down that the invoice was to be a legal warranty, and was to set forth precisely the constituents of the articles, and if that invoice was found to be wrong within the limits not set forth in the Bill, and which no one knew except that they were to be prescribed by the Board of Agriculture, a man was not only subject to a criminal prosecution, but could be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction and fined a considerable sum. That might be right or wrong, but it was extremely extraordinary. He was certain that nobody in the House desired for a moment that injustice should be suffered by anybody under the Bill, but everybody who looked at Clause 3—which provided the method of taking the samples upon which the prosecution was to be founded — would agree that there was a great danger of injustice being done throughout the whole proceeding with reference to the analysis of these samples. Absolutely no provision was made for the submission of, or the giving of any sample of any kind to the man who was going to be prosecuted. Under this arrangement he had no opportunity of checking the analysis; the whole matter from the taking of the sample to the conviction was outside the man altogether. He considered it unfair. The Bill was advowedly a farmers' Bill, framed in the interest, not of the large farmers who could take care of themselves, but of the small farmers, the allotment holders. What was the effect of it? 70 per cent. of the feeding stuffs used in this country were imported. It was a measure of pure unmitigated protection. He would prove his statement. The 70 per cent. of the foodstuffs imported were manufactured by peasants and others of foreign countries from various by-products of which it was impossible to state the constituents. They were brought over here in shiploads and sold direct off the ships, nobody knowing exactly what they consisted of, and under those conditions selling very cheaply. What would happen under this Bill was that that process would be quite impossible, every cargo would have to be landed and warehoused, and would have to be gone through, and inevitably the effect must be to increase enormously the price of all feeding stuffs that came in that way. The hon. Gentleman would not deny that, so far as it affected 70 per cent. of the feeding stuffs of this country. The only real effect of the Bill would be to put the manufacturers engaged in a great industry under cruel and almost impossible disabilities. It would increase the price of feeding stuffs in this country, and the only fact in regard to it which he saw that might commend the Bill to hon. Gentlemen opposite was that it did in the most undoubted way increase the number of officials who would have to interfere with farmers all over the country. The Bill gave enormous power to the Board of Agriculture and handed over to them two enormous industries. It was because he was opposed to handing over industries of this kind blindfolded, tied, and bound to a Government Department, that he hoped the House would pardon him for expressing his strong disapproval of this mischievous, interfering, and ill-formed measure.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) agreed that the seller ought to have a chance of verifying the analysis and that he ought to have a sample. He also agreed that this was a measure for increasing the cost of food stuffs. There would be no demand in his constituency for the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question put, "That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the Consolidated Fund of such sums as may be required to make good any liabilities incurred by the public trustee, or his officers, appointed under any Act of the present session to provide for the appointment of a public trustee, and to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of the salaries or remuneration of the public trustee and his officers, and of other expenses incurred by them in pursuance of such Act."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked the Minister in charge whether he could give any approximate figure to the Committee as to the amount of money involved and the number of officials to be authorised.

*MR. R. PEARCE (Staffordshire, Leek) opposed the Resolution, because it was not, in his opinion, expedient to authorise a charge on the Consolidated Fund. Was this a Motion which should be pressed on the House before the Committee stage of the Trustee Bill itself was taken?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a necessary preliminary to the Committee stage.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) opposed the Resolution with a great deal of reluctance. He entirely agreed with the principle of the Bill, but he entirely objected to the expense that would be incurred by a Bill which he honestly believed would be a failure. He did not for a moment believe that the public would ever avail themselves of public trustees to an extent that would yield commission enough to pay for the expense. This was not a Liberal Bill. It was the child of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield, and was a poor thing but his own.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member appears to be discussing the Bill.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON said he only wished to speak of the money required for this Bill. On a previous occasion the Attorney-General had informed him that no estimate had been made of the cost or of the number of officials that would be required, but he said that the services of officials already holding office would be utilised as far as possible. He (Mr. Henderson) had calculated that there must be some 200 officials appointed under this Bill. In every town where there were over 5,000 inhabitants there would have to be a public trustee and a deputy or, at all events, an office and officials to carry out the provisions of the Bill. It would be precisely the same in degree and extent as the official receiver. The official receivers had never cost less than £24,000 a year over and above the fees they received, and this Bill would cost the country at least £50,000 a year from the very beginning, and it might be a great deal more. When the Attorney-General introduced the Bill he said he thought it would be self-supporting. It would be nothing of the kind, because the public trustee's services would not be availed of by the public. The Liberal Party had been girding at the Ministers to keep down expenditure, but what was the good of keeping down cost at one end if they had thousands of pounds running out at the other? They were being asked to give a blank cheque without a single estimate of any kind. From a long experience of these matters he knew the public trustee would be a failure and the Exchequer would be saddled with an expenditure of from £20,000 to £40,000 a year.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 175; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 238.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)

Mr. R. Pearce.

Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradfrd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalrymple, Viscount
Duffy, William J.
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lupton, Arnold
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Soares, Ernest J.
Starkey, John R.
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Valentia, Viscount
Watt, H. Anderson
White, Patrick (Meath, North)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. J. M. Henderson and Mr. Harmood-Banner.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked the Minister in charge of the Bill to explain it.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said the Bill was explained to the House on the Second Reading, and it was not opposed on that occasion. It had been discussed by a Committee upstairs, and he thought they might fairly assume that the House knew what it contained.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MARRIAGE WITH FOREIGNERS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CLAUDE HAY said they were entitled to an explanation of the Bill from the Minister in charge. How many nationalities had been approached in connection with this matter, and with how many were negotiations in progress?

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland) said there was a full Memorandum on the face of the Bill explaining its object, and as no objection had been raised from any quarter he thought the House would be glad to be spared an explanation. There had been negotiations with France, Germany, and Belgium on the matter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

EXTRADITION BILL. [H.L.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CLAUDE HAY said this was a Bill in regard to which the House should receive some information from the Minister in charge. The preamble stated that bribery was to be made an extraditable offence. The point on which he wished information was whether the United States was the only country with which our Government had been in negotiation with regard to the making of bribery an indictable offence.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said that this Bill was introduced by the late Government last year, but it was not proceeded with. It was introduced this year in the Upper House by the Lord Chancellor and that House had passed it. The Bill was greatly desired by the Foreign Office and the Home Office as well. The initiative came from the Government of the United States, which was most anxious to put down bribery in the national and municipal institutions of the country. The British Government was asked to enable them to recover from this country persons who were charged with the offence of bribery. If any other country desired to make a treaty with this country in regard to the offence, this Bill would give statutory power to the Foreign Office to enable them to agree to such a treaty.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS (REMUNERATION).

Order for Committee thereupon read, and discharged.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Resolved, "That the Statement of the estimated income and expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation, for the year 1906–7, be approved."—(*Mr. Lambert.*)

REVENUE EXCISE DUTY, &c.

Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of an Excise Duty on licences to be taken out by manufacturers for sale of British wines and of a Stamp Duty on awards in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other purposes connected with finance, and of authorising the payment of other expenses that may be incurred under such Act (King's recommendation signified), this day.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of July 13th

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes after One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 19*th July*, 1906.

The Right Hon. Leonard Henry Courtney, having been created Baron Courtney of Penwith, in the county of Cornwall, was (in the usual manner) introduced.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Hampstead Garden Suburb. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Sutton District Water Bill; Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill; Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Sutton District Water Bill; Commited: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Committeed for Tuesday next.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; Leave given to the Select Committee not to sit again till Monday next.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]; Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Pontefract Corporation Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Poole Corporation Water Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Castlemaine be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Earl of Malmesbury; read, and agreed to.

Sutton District Water Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Sutton District Water Bill; read, and agreed to: All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order); Amendments made: Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUNDAY TRADING.

Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 160.) Minutes of Evidence, together with appendices, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

TRADE REPORTS : ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3671. France (Madagascar);
No. 3672. Italy (Province of Leece);
No. 3673. Hayti;
No. 3674. China (Shanghai).

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Annual Report of the President for the session 1905–6.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Return of alien passengers brought to the United Kingdom from ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ended 30th June 1906; together with the number of expulsion orders made during that period requiring aliens to leave the United Kingdom.

HUMBER CONSERVANCY COMMISSION.

Report of the Humber Conservancy Commission.

CUSTOMS.

Fiftieth Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs (for the year ended 31st March 1906).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC RECORDS (THE PALACE COURT).

Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents belonging to the abolished Court of the King's Palace at Westminster which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

PUBLIC SLAUGHTER-HOUSES BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law respecting public slaughter-houses, was presented by the Viscount Hutchison (*E. Donoughmore*); read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 166.)

Post Office Sites Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 161.)

Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill. (No. 162.) Isle of Man (Customs) Bill. (No. 163.) Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Friday the 27th instant. (The Earl Carrington.) (No. 164.)

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next (The Lord Chancellor). (No. 165.)

THE PALACE OF WESTMINSTER.

*LORD STANMORE rose to move that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report with respect to the unfinished condition of the rooms in the Palace of Westminster appropriated to the service of this House, and their approaches.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, it may be within the recollection of some of your Lordships that I have at various times brought forward a Motion of a similar nature to that which I have placed on the Paper to-day. Last year the Motion was accepted by His Majesty's then Government with the cordial concurrence of the then Leader of the Opposition (Earl Spencer), whose enforced absence all of us so deeply deplore. But we were then in the last days of the session, and the nomination of the members of the Committee was not proceeded with, partly on the ground that there was no time for the Committee to sit, and partly because there was some doubt in the minds of the Government as to the best mode in which the inquiry should be carried out, whether by a single or by a Joint-Committee; and it was thought better to postpone the appointment of the Committee until this session.

In the ordinary course of things the Committee, having once been agreed to by the House, would, no doubt, have been reappointed; but since then we have had great events. There has been a dissolution of Parliament and a change of Government, and therefore the Motion does not come before you in quite the same circumstances as it otherwise would have done. But I have put down exactly the same Motion that was adopted by the House last year; and as I have reason to believe that His Majesty's Government are inclined to be as benevolent on this occasion as the late Government were last year, I do not intend to waste your Lordships' time by repeating arguments I have over and over again brought forward. I shall, therefore, content myself with moving the Motion as it stands on the Paper.

I would add, however, before I sit down, that some noble Lords seem to be under the impression that this Committee is to be a sort of Committee of Taste to settle the decoration of the Houses of Parliament in the future. This is an entirely erroneous impression. The idea is, in the first place, that the Committee should examine and schedule those parts of the building which are, as I maintain, in the strictest sense of the word unfinished. Although that unfinished state is less conspicuous to us who are familiar with it, it is conspicuous enough to foreigners and strangers when they visit this Palace. The second object of the Committee is that they should consider and advise the House as to whether, if any works be recommenced at a future time (which must be the subject of future consideration) it would be better to follow the original plan of the Architect, which was that of architectural decoration, or the plan of the Fine Arts Commission, which was that of pictorial decoration.

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report with respect to the unfinished condition of the rooms in the Palace of Westminster appropriated to the service of this House, and their approaches."—(*Lord Stanmore.*)

THE EARL OF PLYMOUTH: My Lords, I should like to say one word in support of the Motion which has just been moved by my noble friend on the Cross Benches. On previous occasions I have, as First Commissioner of Works, given him as sympathetic Answers as I possibly could to the Questions he has asked in this House. I am afraid, however, that on one or two occasions he did not think them of very much value, because they were followed by no promise of active assistance to him in his object; but, as he has said, at the end of last session the late Government did agree to the appointment of a Committee such as he had indicated; and I only rise to say that, having always felt great sympathy with his object, I hope His Majesty's Government will agree to the appointment of the Committee for which he asks.

*THE LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of LIVERPOOL): My Lords, I am happy to be able to inform my noble friend that His Majesty's Government agree to the Motion which he has submitted, and are willing to sanction the appointment of a Select Committee of your Lordships' House to inquire into the matter referred to.

On Question, Motion agreed, to and ordered accordingly.

MACEDONIA.

LORD NEWTON rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any representations had been addressed to the Greek Government with reference to recent incursions of Greek bands into Macedonia.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, in putting the Question which appears in my name on the Paper I am happy to think that it will not be necessary for me to occupy the attention of the House for more than a few minutes. The practice of filibustering in European Turkey has prevailed, practically without intermission, during the past twenty-five years. The activity of the countries concerned in those operations has been regulated almost entirely by political or financial considerations; and the practice is now so well established that it has descended almost into a form of international sport, regulated—and I say this without exaggerating in the slightest —by what I can only term a close season, or, to be more correct, two close seasons. One of these close seasons is formed by the winter, which is so inclement that in the Balkan Peninsula it is impossible to carry on military operations; and the other is that afforded by the autumn, when, in consequence of religious festivities and fasts, and the necessity of attending to the harvest and so on, there is a suspension of operations. These close seasons are observed with a considerable amount of regularity, but during the rest of the year the operations I have described go on continually.

There are three nations which take part in this practice—Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece. On the part of Servia and Bulgaria there has recently been a considerable decrease in activity, for reasons which I will not dwell upon at the present time. The practice of indulging in filibustering expeditions, which are sent out for the purpose of burning, robbery, extorting money, and committing massacres and atrocities of various kinds, is pretty much the same in each case. But there is, nevertheless, a point of difference. With regard to what are known as Bulgarian bands, there is this to be said in their favour—if it be in their favour at all—that they are to a great extent recruited in Macedonia itself; they direct their operations principally against the Turkish authorities and the Turkish Government, and therefore they may claim that their movement, at all events, has some appearance of patriotism.

But the action of the Greek bands, though equally detestable, is of a somewhat different nature. The action of the Greek bands is in reality an aggressive warfare against all the Christian elements in Macedonia, and it is carried on with the object of checking every national movement except the Greek movement. These operations are, of course, carried on under methods with which we are familiar—methods of assassination, massacre, and so forth, of which we read so frequently in the Blue-books; and as for the Greek bands themselves, they differ from those that I have already alluded to, because they consist, as a rule, so I am informed, entirely of mercenaries, men who are paid a regular wage, and who very frequently are Cretans; that is to say, people who have nothing whatever to do with Macedonia itself. The aims of these bands are not military, but, in reality, propagandist. The object is to endeavour to prove, by most brutal and horrible methods, that Macedonia is really a Greek district; and unfortunately they appear to think that the best way of proving their case is to convert schismatic Exarchists and the other race which inhabits that particular part of the world —the Kutzo-Vlachs—to the Patriarchate by force and by employing these detestable methods with which we are familiar. In short, the object of these bands, so far as I am able to make out, is to terrorise the Bulgarians and the Kutzo-Vlachs, and to convert them, in the eye of the outside world, into Greek citizens. It is, in fact, an organised system of terrorising the Bulgarians and the Kutzo-Vlachs—that is to say, the Rumanian element.

Up to a certain point the action of these Greek bands has been, if not actually encouraged by the Turkish Government, at all events ignored by them to a considerable extent. These bands leave Greece with extremely little pretence at secrecy. I am informed that they almost invariably cross at the same places, and there is so little mystery about their movements that they frequently get photographed before they start. Latterly their activity has considerably increased, for reasons which I am not particularly conversant with, but which possibly have something to do with the success attending the festivities at Olympia in the early part of this year; and not only has their activity taken the form of coercing, robbing, and massacring the Greek inhabitants of the provinces which they have invaded, but they have latterly come in contact with the Turkish troops, notably at a place called Grevna. This happened to be a particularly flagrant case, and fortunately we have a report upon it from one of the foreign gendarmerie officers, Colonel Seymour, which I have no doubt is in the possession of my noble friend.

I have in my hand a long list of various outrages committed during recent months by Greek bands, but this information is no doubt also in the possession of the Foreign Office, and I need not draw particular attention to it. But I must add that only to-day I was informed by a Rumanian gentleman, occupying a highly responsible position, that the Rumanian Government has just received intelligence that no less than five new bands have, within the last few days, crossed the frontier, and that two of these bands consisted of 150 men apiece and the other three of seventy men apiece, and that in each case they were commanded by officers in the Greek Regular Army. This is quite sufficient to show the state of things which now prevails in that country, and as long as it continues it appears to me perfectly idle to talk about any general reforms taking place there.

These raids and expeditions naturally result in equally savage reprisals on the part of the races who suffer in consequence of them, and the length of time during which this practice has continued—a practice which, I admit, is not confined to the Greeks, but has been adopted by the neighbouring nations—is one which is little short of a scandal and a disgrace to Europe. It really is a most disgraceful thing that when the Great Powers have nominally taken in hand what they are pleased to call reforms in Macedonia events of this kind still continue. I trust, therefore, that my noble friend will be in a position to inform the House that His Majesty's Government, either themselves or in conjunction with the other Governments affected, have taken decisive steps in order to show the way in which they regard occurrences of this description, and I hope he will be able to assure us that steps will be taken to prevent their re-occurrence in the immediate future.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, my noble friend has detailed to the House, in his short but very clear statement, the painful condition of affairs in regard to the action of the Greek bands in Macedonia. Those of your Lordships who have examined the Papers laid before Parliament from time to time, by the late Government as well as by the present Government, are aware, as he is, that the action of these bands has been one of the gravest sources of difficulty with which the Powers interested in the maintenance of peace and order in those regions have had to deal.

I wish I could say that in any respect what my noble friend has stated is exaggerated, but I cannot do so. My noble friend bases his statement upon information which is in his possession, as it is in that of your Lordships generally, and upon his own knowledge and information which he has obtained from sources at his command. It is not, therefore, necessary for me to travel over the painful details of this subject. I am glad to be relieved of any such duty, because I am sure those who have been at the Foreign Office recently will confirm me when I say that many of the details of this subject are so painful, and, as my noble friend has said, so horrible, that the eye almost shrinks from the paper, and the human voice hardly desires to be employed in placing before any assembly facts which are of the same order as those that lead occasionally in an English court of justice to that process with which those of us who are concerned in the administration of justice are familiar—namely, the clearing of the court because some evidence is to be given which it is not desirable should be generally heard.

The condition of things described by my noble friend is undoubtedly grave, and His Majesty's Government recognise that it is one with which it is desirable, so far as the circumstances permit, for this country and the other Great Powers with whom we act in these questions to deal. His Majesty's representative at Athens has during the last three months addressed remonstrances to the Greek Government in regard to the formation of these bands in Greek territory, and it has been pointed out how materially the difficulties of the Great Powers in regard to Macedonia are thereby increased. In consequence of these remonstrances made by His Majesty's Government and by those of other Powers, the Greek Government addressed, towards the end of last month, a communication to all the Powers to the effect that the Government were taking renewed measures to prevent the Turco-Greek frontier being crossed by suspected persons.

As the activity of the Greek bands in Macedonia nevertheless continued, it has been thought desirable that more energetic measures should be taken to put a stop to this evil, which, as I have stated, was felt to be one of the chief causes of the prevailing unrest and insecurity in the three Macedonian vilayets. I may remind your Lordships that this is also one of the reasons which affords to the Turkish Government an excuse—a not altogether unreasonable excuse—for keeping up, at any rate, some portion of that military force, the expense of which weighs down the Macedonian Budget.

My noble friend dealt quite accurately with the action of these bands. Their activity is especially marked in the districts conterminous with the Greek frontier. It was decided by the Powers to take concerted action in the matter; and on the 3rd instant a joint verbal representation was made to the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs by the representatives of the six Powers at Athens, with regard to the persistent activity of these bands, and the support and encouragement which they received from the Greek side of the frontier. The loyal co-operation of the adjoining State in guarding this extended and mountainous frontier is specially enjoined on Greece by Article XIV. of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey which concluded the late war; and, of course, the obligation is reciprocal. It has been pointed out that those who organise the bands are alienating the best friends of Greece and are jeopardising her interests in all other directions in pursuit of what may be regarded as an aggressive policy, of which it is difficult to understand the purpose or foresee the end. His Majesty's Government trust that the Government of Greece will spare no efforts in putting an end to this dangerous condition of affairs.

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 19*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting, Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill. Considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords].

Amendments to Newport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [Lords]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill, That they concur with the Commons in their Message of the 5th instant in suspending the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; from Aikton (three); Benhall; Brandon; Brinkworth; Cumrew; Parkeston; Salehurst; Wigton (two); and Wiltshire; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petition from Salehurst (two); against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Forsbrook; and Wreay; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.

Petition from Dartford, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS.

Petition from Carlisle, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petition from Stockport, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CUSTOMS.

Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report of the Commissioners of Customs for the year ended 31st March, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the table.

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1906-7).

Estimate presented, of the further sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 271.]

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th June; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 272.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Councils of the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees and of the County Borough of Wigan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Boroughs [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3675 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Caledonian Canal. Copy of One hundred and first Report of the Commissioners [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 273.]

CYPRUS.

Return ordered, of all sums paid in the year 1905-6 out of the moneys arising from the Revenues of Cyprus, in discharge of the Interest upon the Turkish Loan guaranteed by this country and France in

1855; of all the sums voted by Parliament during the year in aid of the Administration of Cyprus; and of the Surplus remaining over and above the payments made, with interest thereon (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 281, of Session 1905).—(*Sir Carne Rasch.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Non-Pension Watchers' Wages.

MR. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in dealing with the case of the Customs' watchers, he will give attention to the complaints of the non-pensioner watchers in regard to their wages; and whether, in view of the fact that for the past ten years, with very few exceptions, none but pensioners have been appointed to this position, he will consider the possibility of introducing a special measure for dealing with the salary of those watchers who have no pensions and whose services range from ten to forty years.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The non-pensioners and the pensioner watchers are engaged on the same duties. It would not, therefore, be possible to distinguish between them. I have, however, agreed to raise the pay of these men, which is at present 21s. rising to 24s. a week, to 24s. a week in every case.

Russian Duties.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what has been the result of the representations, promised some months ago, with regard to the large increases proposed in the duties levied upon British goods entering Russia.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) The Russian Government have not agreed to make any further reductions in their customs duties.

Roumanian Customs Tariff on Syphons.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if Article 539 of the Roumanian Customs Tariff, annexed to the recent Commercial Treaty with Great Britain, does not fix the duty upon British syphons and mineral water bottles, whether coloured or not, at four francs per 100 kilos; in such case, if he can explain why a duty of six francs was recently levied on a consignment of fifty-four cases of plain bottles from the Phœnix and Don Glass Works, at Mexborough, in the county of York; and if a refund of the excess duty already paid will be insisted upon.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The tariff schedule appended to the recent Anglo-Roumanian Commercial Treaty does not provide for the rate of the Roumanian import duty on syphons and mineral water bottles. The rate of four francs per 100 kilogrammes, established under No. 539 of the Roumanian General Tariff, applies to syphons and mineral water bottles of capacity not less than twenty litres. Those of less capacity pay, under No. 540 of the Tariff, at a rate of six francs per 100 kilos.

Attack on a British Soldier at Mex.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to communicate regarding the alleged assault upon a British soldier in Alexandria in the early part of the present month.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I have been informed that a British soldier was recently attacked at night by Natives while passing through the village of Mex, near Alexandria. The object of the attack was theft. The soldier was pulled off his donkey and kicked in the stomach by his assailants, and was left by them lying in the road. The principal assailant has been identified, and will be tried before the ordinary tribunal.

Murder of a European at Busra.

MR. REES: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Arabs who murdered the European agent of the firm of Messrs. Lynch, at Busra, have been arrested and sentenced.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) Sixteen persons are implicated in the Maaghil outrage. Three have been arrested by the Ottoman authorities, and three by the Sheik of Mohammerah. The trial has not yet taken place.

Countess of Kingston's Estate.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Estates Commissioners are now in a position to fix a date for the inspection and report upon the proposed sale of the Kingston Estate and examination of the purchase agreements.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that there are before the Estates Commissioners five separate originating applications in respect of different portions of the Countess of Kingston's estate. The Commissioners do not anticipate that their inspector's reports upon these applications will be completed before October next. In three of the cases, in which the purchase agreements were lodged in February, 1905, the turn for inspection in order of priority has not yet come.

Aughnacloy Police.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether many extra police were drafted into Aughnacloy, county Tyrone, for July 12th; and, if so, for what purpose were they sent, and at whose expense.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that on the occasion mentioned an extra force of twenty policemen was drafted from other countries into Aughnacloy, county Tyrone, for the purpose of preserving the peace in connection with a large demonstration at that place. One half of the expense is chargeable on the rates, and the other half is borne by the Constabulary Vote.

Donery Evicted Tenant.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for a holding from Mr. James Broderick, Donery, Loughrea, an evicted tenant, on the Blake Estate; and whether, seeing that a grass farm belonging to Mr. Blake is in the immediate neighbourhood, steps will be taken to try and purchase this farm with the object, amongst other things, of providing a holding for Mr. Broderick

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received Mr. Broderick's application. The Commissioners are in communication with Mr. Blake with a view to the purchase of the grazing farm referred to, and should they purchase it they will duly consider the application of the evicted tenant in connection with its re-sale.

Cattle Outrage near Loughrea.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on July 4th a number of cattle on Mr. Kennedy's farm at Earlsfort, near Loughrea, were turned out into the public road and covered with paint or tar, that the veterinary surgeon has reported that it is impossible to remove the paint, and that it will be necessary to wait until the hair falls off, during which period the cattle will suffer great pain; whether the police have arrested the perpetrators of this outrage; and whether they have any knowledge as to the motive.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that on the occasion mentioned three of Mr. Kennedy's cattle were smeared in places with green paint, but none of the cattle were turned out on the public road. The police have no information that a veterinary surgeon has seen or reported upon the animals. The police have not succeeded in tracing the offenders and have no knowledge as to the motive.

Emigration of Stoney Estate Tenants.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, instead of planting poor tenants who lived on the Stoney Estate on the grazing ranches, the Congested Districts Board sent a number of them away to America, the cost of whose emigration was borne out of the funds of that board; that they have grazing lands in their possession which might have been given to these people; and, if so, can he state that public funds entrusted to this board will not be applied to sending poor people out of the country in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that the Congested Districts Board did not send any of the tenants on the Stoney Estate to America, or in any way suggest their emigration. When the Board purchased the property, five of these tenants had decided to emigrate, four of them being unable to work their holdings. The Board paid them fifteen and a half years purchase for their interests as tenants, because they thought it better to add their land to other small holdings than to allow it to be bought by strangers. One of the townlands on the estate, which contained from 200 to 300 acres, was extremely congested, being occupied by fifty tenants, each of whom held from twenty to thirty separate small plots. The Board have arranged to buy grazing lands for the benefit of these tenants, but have not yet been able to distribute them, as the lands have not yet been vested in the Board. The grazing was publicly offered by the Board, and some tenants took portion of it. The Board have never assisted emigration from Ireland.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the guarantors for the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway, in the Ballinrobe union and barony of Kilmaine, county Mayo, have no representation on the board of directors of that line; that the business up to the present has been managed by nominees of the Midland Great Western Railway Company directors; if so, why are the guarantors deprived of the right to representation; and what steps are necessary to be taken with a view to having the taxpayers represented on a body that has to deal annually with several thousand pounds sterling of their money.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that it is the fact that the guarantors of the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway are not represented on the board of directors. The board is, I am informed, elected annually by the shareholders, as provided by the articles of association. The present board consists of four gentlemen, one of whom is the chairman of the Midland Great Western Railway Company. The presentment of the grand jury scheduled to the Order in Council of 19th May, 1890, under which the line was constructed, provides for the representation of the guaranteeing baronies. For some reason which does not appear the Order in Council itself does not expressly confirm the provision as to the representation of these baronies; and I am advised that the question whether right to representation still exists is not one for the Government to decide. Persons claiming representation must be guided by their own advisers as to any steps they may take in the matter. It may, however, be desirable to add that as the line is worked under agreement the Midland Great Western Railway Company for 50 per cent. of the gross receipts, the duties of the directors with respect to the contributions of the guaranteeing ratepayers consist mainly in the distribution of such moneys among the shareholders.

Ballinrobe Canal.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the want of communication between the district around Tourmakeady and Ballinrobe, county Mayo; whether he is aware that the people from that district who have to attend the nearest market town have to spend three days in doing so, and have to cover a distance of forty Irish miles; that if the canal were completed between the town of Ballinrobe and Lough Mask, the journey from Tourmakeady to Ballinrobe could be made in little more than an hour; that it would materially benefit the people of the town and district; that only a sum of about £2,500 is required to complete the work; and, if so, whether he will recommend the Congested Districts Board and the Agricultural Department to undertake the work jointly, and thereby open up a vast tract of country hitherto much neglected.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The question of undertaking works for the completion of the canal referred to has been considered by both the Congested Districts Board and the Department of Agriculture. The cost, however, has been estimated at from four to six times the amount mentioned by the hon. Member, and neither the Board nor the Department has funds at its disposal for works of such magnitude.

The question is one which persons locally interested might possibly, with advantage, bring before the Royal Commission on Canals when that body visits Ireland.

Stoney Estate, Newport.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board purchased the Stoney Estate, near Newport, county Mayo, over six years ago; that for a number of years, although there were some hundreds of acres of grazing lands on the estate, these lands were put up for competition and bought in by graziers from Achill and Ballycroy; that there were many tenants on the estate who did not own more than two pound's worth of land and were living in a state of poverty all those years; and, if so, why did the Board not see to their wants instead of letting the grazing lands out to persons who already had land, and only used this place for the fattening of bullocks.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Congested Districts Board purchased part of the Stoney Estate, six years ago, but could not resell the holdings until they had obtained arable land with which to enlarge them. The Board have since arranged to buy such land, but have not yet become legal owners of it. The grazing land referred to cannot be distributed until it is vested in the Board, and as the Board have had to pay interest on the purchase money, they offered the land publicly for grazing. Some of it was taken by the tenants. The Board have not sold any land to graziers. They have had no other object in view than the benefit of the tenants, but time is necessary for carrying out such extensive changes as those they have in view.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Henry R. Vereker, assistant land valuer to the Congested Districts Board, was appointed to carry on negotiations for the transfer of the lands on the Stoney estate on which he was agent; that he deprived the tenants of that estate of the grazing rights on a mountain which they enjoyed for many years; that he sold 900 acres of that mountain to the landlord, Mr. Stoney, for £600; that he fixed the purchase terms at about thirty-four years purchase on the part of the estate which the poorer tenants were taking over; and whether, under the circumstances, he will advise the Board, if not yet too late, to send some dis interested valuer there?

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that Mr. Vereker, who is the assistant chief land inspector to the Congested Districts Board, did not negotiate the purchase of the Stoney Estate. Mr. Vereker did not enter the Board's service until several years after the Board had purchased the property. It is not the case that the tenants had rights of grazing on the mountain land re-sold to Mr. Stoney by the Board. The circumstances of that re sale, in consideration of which the Board were enabled to purchase the additional arable land from Mr. Stoney, are fully stated in my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for West Mayo on 11th June †. Mr. Vereker has taken no part in the Board's transactions in connection with the estate.

Clanmorris Estate Dispute.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a sworn statement made by James Tuohy, a tenant on the Glanmorris Estate, setting forth charges against a rent office clerk, named Good, and his son-in-law, named Black, of trying to obtain a portion of land on that estate fraudulently, and with the intention of becoming possessed of public money in a manner contrary to the spirit of the Land Act of 1903: and, if so, whether he will take any steps to have these two men arraigned by the public prosecutor, with a view to securing the better working of the Act and preventing any such attempts in future in any other part of Ireland?

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have received a copy of the sworn statement referred to, and a copy has also been received by the Estates Commissioners. I have already informed the hon. Member that an action at the suit of Lord Clanmorris and others has been instituted in the Chancery Division with the object of compelling the Estates Commissioners to sell the land in question to Messrs. Good and Black. The question raised by the sworn statement is one which is pertinent to the issue to be decided by the Chancery Division, and while that action is pending it would not be possible for the executive Government to consider whether any proceedings are called for.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 935.

Sir John Nugent Humble's Estate.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in reference to the originating application for the sale of his estate in county Waterford, lodged by Sir John Nugent Humble, Mr. Charles Nugent Humble, a brother of the vendor, is named as a tenant who proposes to purchase certain lands on the estate; whether the Estates Commissioners are aware that these lands are partly evicted lands and partly untenanted lands of which Mr. Humble has only recently become tenant; whether the Estates Commissioners will have special inquiry made by one of their inspectors into the claims of the evicted tenants; and whether one of the inspectors has already been refused permission by the landlord to go on these evicted lands; and, if so, will it be intimated to him that his application for advances cannot be considered?

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the originating application lodged in respect of portion of the estate referred to sets out Charles Nugent Humble as the proposed purchaser of certain holdings of which he is stated to be the tenant. The matter will be fully inquired into when the estate is being inspected in the ordinary course. The Report of the inspector as to the evicted tenants has not yet been received, and the Commissioners have therefore no knowledge of the statements alleged in the latter part of the Question.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the inspector of the Estates Commissioners has already interviewed the evicted tenants on the estates of Sir John Nugent Humble, the Earl of Huntingdon, Mr. R. J. Ussher, and many others, in the county of Waterford, and ascertained all the facts of their cases; whether the landlords named have all lodged originating applications with the Estates Commissioners; and whether they or some of them have, notwithstanding, refused permission to the inspector to inspect the evicted holdings and untenanted lands; and, if so, what action the Estates Commissioners propose to take as regards their applications for advances.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that their inspectors have inquired into the cases of evicted tenants on some of the estates mentioned, but such reports as have been received have not yet been considered by the Commissioners, and no decision has been arrived at with regard to these cases. The Commissioners have no information that the landlords have refused the inspectors permission to inspect evicted farms and untenanted lands. Until the facts are fully before them the Commissioners are unable to state what decision they may arrive at in respect of applications for advances.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the amount of the advance made under the Land Purchase Acts prior to 1900 by the Land Commission to Charles Nugent Humble for the purchase of a holding or holdings on the estate of his brother, Sir John Nugent Humble, in county Waterford; whether the Land Commissioners differed in opinion as to the propriety of making such advance; and whether there was an appeal from the decision of the Commissioner who first decided on the application for the advance.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) In the year 1895 the Land Commission advanced to Mr. C. N. Humble sums amounting to £2,823 for the purchase of six holdings on the estate of Sir John Nugent Humble. Full particulars of these advances are given at page 62 of Parliamentary Paper, No. 278 of that year. The Land Commissioner who first heard the case refused to sanction the advances, but this decision was reversed on appeal I understand that the case is fully reported in the *Irish Law Times Reports.*

Woodroffe Estate, Lismore.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the untenanted lands on the Woodroffe estate, near Lismore, have yet been offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners; if not, will they communicate with Messrs. Dobbyn and McLevy, Gardiner Street, Dublin, who have carriage of sale; whether the Estates Commissioners have agreed to purchase the Parker Estate untenanted lands at Janeville, near Tallow; and, if not, in view of the fact that their inspector was arranging more than a year ago for the allocation of this land, can he state the cause of delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the Woodroffe Estate has not been offered for sale to them, but they will communicate on the subject with the firm of solicitors named. The Commissioners intend shortly to make an offer to the Land Judge for the purchase of the Parker Estate, and if their offer should be accepted a scheme for the distribution of the untenanted lands will be prepared without delay.

Guns for the Volunteers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether orders have been given for the conversion into quick-firers of the old artillery 15-pounder guns for use by the Volunteers; if so, what is the number of guns to be converted; what will be the cost of conversion, including cost of ammunition; when will the guns be in the hands of the Volunteers; and if these weapons will fulfil all requirements in point of range, trajectory, velocity, and penetration, in the event of invasion.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Until the trials now being carried out with a converted 15-pounder gun are completed, it will not be possible to settle the design. I am not, therefore, able at present to give any reply to the Question.

Army Wastage.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War what was the actual waste from all causes in 1904 and 1905 respectively of the following battalions: 2nd Battalion West Riding Regiment, 1st Battalion Scottish Rifles, 1st Battalion Royal Sussex Regiment, and 1st Battalion Devonshire Regiment; and what proportion of the wastage in each case was due to the passage to the first class Army Reserve of men enlisted for three years only.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The wastage from all causes, including men transferred to other battalions or corps, was as follows:—

	Year ending 30th September 1904.		Year ending 30th September 1905.	
	Wastage.	Three years men transferred to Reserve.	Wastage.	Three years men transferred to Reserve.
2nd West Riding - -	164	1	180	16
1st Scottish Rifles - -	196	None	213	37
1st Royal Sussex - -	96	6	163	None
1st Devonshire - -	160	None	128	1

Coldstream Guards.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the various arrangements involved in the decision of the Government to despatch the condemned battalion of Coldstream Guards to Egypt will be announced before the end of the session.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I cannot undertake at present to say whether the matters mentioned can be announced before the end of the session.

Volunteers and Naval Fortresses.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: To ask the Secretary of State for War what proportion of the 149,000 Volunteers told off under his scheme for the defence of naval fortresses and for protection against raids are to be detailed for the first and second purposes, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) These figures are confidential and cannot therefore be given to the hon. Baronet.

Volunteer Camps.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, now that the Volunteer Field Army Brigades will cease to exist after the current financial year, it is intended to compel Volunteer battalions willing to train in camp for fifteen days to train for only seven days.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am unable, at the present time, to give any information as to the future training of the Volunteer force.

British Army in India.

SIR CARNE RASCH: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the proportion of guns to men in India, including British and Indian troops.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is not considered expedient in the interests of Imperial defence to publish the information for which the hon. and gallant Member asks.

Reduction of the Army.

LORD J. JOICEY-CECIL (Lincolnshire, Stamford): To ask the Secretary of State for War if directions have already been given to proceed with the disbandment of regular troops.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The reply is in the negative.

General Bullock.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Commander-in Chief of the Army of Occupation in Egypt, General Bullock, left Egypt for Europe about a week ago upon a three months' furlough; and whether, in view of the prevailing unrest in Egypt, he will be asked immediately, or, if not, how soon to return to his post.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This officer arrived in England on three months' leave of absence on the 9th instant. It is not proposed to order him to return at present.

Troops Ready for Mobilisation.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): To ask the Secretary of State for War what was the total Army Reserve of the infantry of the line available for mobilisation in 1899, after deducting sick and other casualties; how many battalions, if any, went out short of their full establishment; and how many line infantry men of the first-class Army Reserve remained available for supplying waste after the battalions had been mobilised.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) 45,338 reservists of infantry of the line were available for mobilisation, after deducting medically unfit for service abroad and men abroad or at sea. Fifty-five battalions went out below full establishment; in fourteen of these the deficit was less than thirty, and in seventeen cases drafts had very recently been furnished to India. It must be remembered also that Section "D" could not be called out in the earlier stages of the mobilisation. 16,000 remained available after the battalions had mobilised, and this number was sent out to South Africa.

Reservists.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the number of reservists which will be furnished by 148 battalions of the line on an establishment of 750 men per battalion enlisted for seven years with the colours and five years with the reserve.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Assuming that the right hon. Gentleman is referring to the new establishments for the Colonies as outlined in my speech on Army Estimates, the figures for the Reserve taking a Home establishment of 805 non-commissioned officers and men (*i.e.*, 750 rank and file), would be almost 63,900 in the normal. The Home establishment, however, proposed in my speech was 775 non-commissioned officers and men (*i.e.*, 720 rank and file), and the calculated reserve for this would be about 62,900.

Artillery Volunteers.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will now give effect to the decision of the Army Council, arrived at in 1905, and reversed in 1906, and will convert the Lanark Artillery Volunteers and the 4th West Riding of Yorkshire (Sheffield) Artillery Volunteers into field batteries, organised in the manner approved by the Army Council and agreed to by the commanding officers of the corps concerned; and whether he will further give effect to the decision of the Army Council to supply the corps with the Ehrhardt quick-firing guns in lieu of the obsolete 16-pounder guns with which they are at present armed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not at present in a position to make any definite statement in regard to the future organisation of any particular Volunteer corps. The time for a final settlement has not yet arrived. As regards guns, as I have already informed the House, trials with a converted 15-pounder gun are now proceeding, and no decision has therefore been reached.

Japanese Army

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that Japan, our ally, is increasing her Army at the time that the English Government proposes to reduce the numbers of the English Army; whether the Indian Government has been consulted on the question of this reduction; and whether it is, under the circumstances, in accordance with the terms of our agreement with Japan.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The matters mentioned by the hon. Member cannot be properly dealt with in an Answer to a Question. I must, however, point out that the addition to the Japanese Army was made during the war and has been since retained; and that as regards India there has been no reduction in the garrison of that country.

Committee on a Territorial Army.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): To ask the Secretary of State for War when the Report of the Committee which is inquiring into the formation of a territorial Army is likely to be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A considerable period is likely to elapse before this Committee concludes its deliberations, and I am not, therefore, at present able to give any information regarding its recommendations.

Denshawi Sentences.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the publication of a page of photographs of the Denshawi hangings and floggings: will he say why were persons allowed by the authorities to take photographs of punishments intended as measures of discipline for the Native population; were the photographers authorised directly or indirectly to take such photographs by the civilians or military men charged with the superintendence of these hangings and floggings; were the persons who took the photographs civilians or military men; under what circumstances and for what purpose were these photographs taken, and what is the explanation, if any, for their appearance in an English illustrated paper; and whether directions will be issued forbidding in the future the taking of photographs.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I have no information as to the circumstances under which the photographs were taken. All spectators were kept at a considerable distance from the scene of the executions by a cordon of police, with the exception of the members of the Press, who were on the public road. The authorities had no responsibility either for the taking of the photographs or their publication.

Russian Government and Mr. Geddes.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any further information regarding the case of Mr. Geddes, whose claim for compensation from the Russian Government has been under consideration for several months.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) His Majesty's Government are still in communication with the Russian Government on the subject, who have referred to their authorities in the Far East in order that supplementary information respecting the case may be obtained and a further inquiry held.

Manchester Police.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the many charges made against the Manchester police, he will advise the withholding of the Government grant towards the maintenance of the police until such time as these charges have been satisfactorily explained, or will he order a Home Office inquiry into the Manchester police affairs, similar to the one held in 1897, which forms a precedent.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The charges which were made against the Manchester police were the subject of an inquiry held in March of last year by the police authority of the borough, the Watch Committee. I know of no reason for any further inquiry, and certainly of none for the withholding of the Government grant.

Salford Council School Fees.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Education what answer has been returned to the application of the Salford Education Committee (dated 20th June ultimo), for permission to charge fees in the new council school in Devonshire Street, Higher Broughton; and whether he has received a resolution passed by a well-attended meeting of the inhabitants strongly protesting against the proposal.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The case is still under consideration and the Board are awaiting the reply of the local education authority to certain questions.

Register of Teachers.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he contemplates establishing, by Order in Council or otherwise, any general register of teachers in place of the present register.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not prepared to make any statement at present on the matter.

Overtime at Devonport Dockyard.

SIR JOHN BENN (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that, owing to the pressure of work consequent on the preparation of the annual Estimates, considerable overtime has been worked by the staff in the Naval Store Office, at Devonport Dockyard, and that, unlike other departments in the public service, no payment is made for this extra attendance; and whether some recognition can be made for this extra labour.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) It appears from the monthly returns received from Devonport that the total extra attendance since the beginning of the year has been less than one hour per man, and no reason is therefore seen for any special payment.

Chorlton Relieving Officer.

DR. SHIPMAN (Northampton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will explain why, in answer to a letter from the Chorlton Board of Guardians asking whether the Local Government Board would sanction the appointment of a woman as relieving officer, a reply was sent stating that it was undesirable in ordinary circumstances that the appointment should be held by a woman.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) In reply to an inquiry from the clerk, stated to be made for his personal information, the Local Government Board informed him that they had in one or two exceptional cases assented to the appointment of a woman as relieving officer, but that they thought it undesirable in ordinary circumstances that the appointment should be held by a woman. Their reason for this view is that there are some duties devolving on a relieving officer, such, for instance, as those in connection with lunatics, which, in the opinion of the Board, cannot be satisfactorily performed by a woman.

Vagrancy.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can see his way to furnish a list of the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy which can be carried into effect by administrative action and without legislation; and whether he will give the number, if any, of these recommendations which have been adopted by his

Department, and which of those not yet carried into effect it is his intention to adopt.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns*): The main recommendation of the Committee is to the effect that the police should become the authority to deal with vagrants instead of the guardians. Their other recommendations, so far as relates to matters with which I am concerned, so largely depend on their main recommendation that, until it is settled whether this should be adopted, it is scarcely possible to say how they should be effected, nor would it seem worth while to attempt to deal with them. As I have already stated, I am in communication with my right hon. friend the Home Secretary on the subject of the recommendations of the Committee.

Supervisors of Inland Revenue.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he has any further information to give in regard to arrangements for examinations for candidates for supervisorships of Inland Revenue; and can he say if in the future the examinations will be held at regular periods of which adequate notice will be given.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Provided the Board of Inland Revenue are satisfied that the proposals would be agreeable to the service as a whole the following arrangements for the examination of candidates for the post of supervisor can be made:—(a) The examinations to be held once a year; (b) Such examinations to be between 1st November and 1st March; (c) Four months notice of the approximate date of the examination to be given.

Trade Union Reports on Unemployment.

MR. SNOWDEN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the names of the trade unions which gave reports in regard to unemployed members for the month of May last.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I regret that I am unable, without the consent of the 272 trade unions, which make monthly returns of employment to the Board of Trade, to disclose the names of these societies. I shall be happy, however, to furnish the hon. Member, if he desires it, with any general information in my power as to the groups of trades represented by these unions.

Great North of Ireland Railway Delay.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the attention of the Great Northern Railway of Ireland and Messrs. G. and J. Burns, of Glasgow, will be called to the inconvenience caused to the travelling public by the failure of the train from Derry due in Belfast at 3.40 p.m. to arrive in time to enable passengers to travel by the steamer "Viper" to Glasgow, which sails at 4 p.m.; whether he is aware that the new steamer has a greater speed than its predecessor and could therefore sail later; whether he is also aware that the train generally arrives late; and whether, in the public interest, he will represent to these companies the advisability of running the train and the steamer in connection.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am communicating the hon. Member's Question to the railway company for their observations, and will acquaint him with the result.

Great Eastern Railway Sidings.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Eastern Railway Company disregard the provisions of The Railways (Private Sidings) Act, 1904, and The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1894, by refusing to allow private sidings to be connected with their system until the traders requiring such sidings sign an agreement to contract themselves out of the benefits of Section 4 of the last-mentioned Act; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Complaint has been made to the Board of Trade that such a provision is required in sidings agreements by the railway company in question, and the Board are in communication with the company thereon. In the event of an amicable settlement not being reached the matter seems one in which the complainants have their legal remedy. No case has yet been decided by the courts under the first of the two Acts mentioned by my hon. friend, and the result of any litigation thereunder will be carefully watched by the Board.

Railway Companies' Capital.

MR. HYDE (Wednesbury): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, to facilitate the placing of the share capital of new railway companies, and having regard to the fact that 2½ per cent. Consols are under 88, he would propose the alteration of Standing Order 167, sub-section 1, whereby interest at the rate of not exceeding 3 per cent. may be paid out of capital by railway companies during construction (which rate was fixed by amendment of the Standing Order on the 12th August, 1896, when 2¾ per cent. Consols were about 110), so that such rate of interest may be restored to not exceeding 4 per cent. (at which rate it was fixed by Standing Order on the 6th June, 1883, when 3 per cent. Consols were at par); and whether he would be prepared to receive a deputation on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I will communicate with the Chairman of Ways and Means and with the Lord Chairman of Committees on this subject, and will let the hon. Member know the result.

Carnarvon Castle.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the First Commissioner of Works if it is proposed to carry out work of restoration at Carnarvon Castle.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) Works of restoration have been going on for some years past at Carnarvon Castle. I am conferring with the Constable of the castle, Sir John Puleston, as to the further works which may be necessary for the preservation of the fabric.

Liquor Trade in the Madras Presidency.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that two additional shops for the sale of imported liquors have recently been opened in the towns of Gooty and Uravakonda, in the Madras Presidency, and that another shop has been transferred to an objectionable site in the village of Guntakul in the same district; whether the collector has disregarded the protests of the inhabitants against the opening of these shops; and whether, after inquiry, he will give instructions to the Board of Revenue to withhold its sanction to these extra facilities, in accordance with the declared policy of the Government of India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) In the Madras Presidency, as elsewhere, the rule is in force that the licensing authority shall give due weight to local opinion in deciding questions of this nature. I am not acquainted with the circumstances to which my hon. friend refers, but I have no reason to suppose that the rule which the local government has laid down is disregarded by its officers, and I am not disposed to interfere with the discretionary authority which by the law vests in the Board of Revenue.

Lambert Estate, Athenry.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police authorities have instructed the police to visit the houses of tenants on the Lambert Estate, Athenry, threatening the occupiers with certain proceedings if they do not pay rent at once to the Courts.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that the police authorities have given no such instructions, and are not aware of any circumstances which afford ground for the suggestion.

Feagh National School, Newbliss.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what length of service has Mr. R. I. McCurdy, of Feagh national school, Newbliss, county Monaghan, given under the National Board of Education; if McCurdy's school records show that he has given good and efficient service up to 1900 under the old results system; how many bad reports has he received from the inspector since 1900; and if compulsorily retired what are McCurdy's pension rights.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the Commissioners of National Education that Mr. McCurdy has been a national school teacher since January, 1876, and has therefore had thirty and a half years service. It has been decided to withdraw salary from him as principal teacher from 31st inst. Mr. McCurdy's records do not show that he gave good and efficient service up to 1900. Prior to that date he was reprimanded or admonished on several occasions, and attention was repeatedly drawn to the inefficiency of his teaching. Since 1900 he has received three bad reports from the inspector. Mr. McCurdy is not being compulsorily retired. He will still be eligible for appointment as an assistant teacher.

Mountain Batteries in India.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to maintain mountain batteries anywhere except in India; what steps are to be taken for training drafts for the British mountain batteries.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It it not at present proposed to maintain mountain batteries except in India. Drafts will, as heretofore, be sent from garrison companies at Home and be trained in India.

Army Stations.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what changes have been made, or are to be at once made, in the force to be kept at the stations named in Statements (2) and (3) by the late Secretary of State for War on April 15th, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not at present able to state the detailed changes which will have to be made in the disposition of the Scuth African garrison to which the Question alludes.

General Staff.

SIR ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the establishment of the general staff of the Army has now been fully settled; and whether he will give, in the form of a Return or otherwise, the number and names of the officers appointed to join the general staff, together with the regulations affecting their appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is hoped that an Army Order announcing the formal organisation of the general staff and containing the regulations for the discharge of its duties will be issued at an early date. The names of the officers will be shown in the Army List.

War Stores Scandals.

SIR ROBERT HOBART: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, on the conclusion of the evidence now being taken by the Royal Commission on the scandals connected with the loss of warlike stores in and after the late South African War, he will give directions that a similar inquiry should be made into the scandals connected with the Remount Department, and the losses and waste of horses both by land and sea, and the responsibility of all the officers concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A full inquiry was held on the administration of the Army Remount Department during the South African War, and the Report was published in 1902. I do not think any further inquiry is necessary.

Yealm Fishery, South Devon.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the fishing grounds of the fishermen resident at the mouth of the Yealm, South Devon, are being very seriously injured and circumscribed by the discharges of mud and refuse from the Hamoaze by hoppers belonging to His Majesty's Dockyard, Devonport, and by other barges working in connection with the dockyard construction contracts in Devonport; and whether he will consider the possibility of stopping a practice which is reducing the fishing ground in area, and is damaging the interests of a number of fishermen.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Admiralty were not aware of any such injury as that described being done to the fishing grounds, and until the hon. Member's Question no complaint has been received since the depositing ground was changed to suit the convenience of fishermen in 1894. Inquiry, however, is being made, and the result will be communicated to the hon. Member as early as practicable.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Montagu."

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how much has approximately been spent to date on the salvage operations for the floating of H.M.S. "Montagu"; and what proportion this sum bears to the estimated value of the damaged ship when floated.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): Operations are still in progress and it is impossible to make any statement on this subject at present.

Cocaine Consumption in Delhi.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): On behalf on the hon. Member for West Denbighshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the spead of the cocaine habit among all classes of the population of the city of Delhi; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the subject, with a view to the prohibition of the common sale of the drug in India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The traffic in the drug has already been placed under restrictions in provinces where there was evidence of extensive and improper use. The Punjab Excise Commissioner in his latest Report has stated that in Delhi the habit is not at all widespread. The local Government may, I think, be trusted to adopt such precautions as may be necessary.

Rewards for Tiger Slaying.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that man-eaters are rare exceptions among tigers, and that others of the species cause no loss and danger to human life, he will consider the propriety of referring to the Government of India the question of the indiscriminate offer of rewards, in order to gain which professional slaughterers destroy these animals.

MR. MORLEY: I am afraid that I cannot promise to address the Goverment of India in the sense suggested by the hon. Member, nor should I expect them to share his views on the subject of the preservation of tigers.

*MR. REES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a differential tariff on tigers is an exceedingly simple thing, as man-eaters are far better known to the villagers in India than murderers are to the police in Europe?

[No Answer was returned.]

Indian Military Expenditure.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what sum out of the increase of military expenditure accorded by the late Viceroy in Council to the Commander-in-Chief was for acquisition of land, for buildings, water supply, and otherwise in connection with proposed new military advanced stations at Mastung, and in the Kurram; whether difficulties connected with water supply and also with probable effect on recruiting have caused the abandonment of the Mastung, Kurram, and any other such proposals, and what saving has thereby been effected and to what new services applied; whether any saving is likely to be effected on the total amount of the military expenditure of India as increased by the redistribution scheme; and how the defence expenditure of India in the present year compares with that contemplated by the late Viceroy in Council in agreeing to the redistribution and reorganisation schemes of the Commander-in-Chief.

MR. MORLEY: The proposals submitted by the Commander-in-Chief to the late Governor-General in Council included the establishment of a cantonment at or near Mastung, at a cost roughly estimated at about £150,000. It is now thought, after further examination of the country, that a better site for the proposed cantonment has been found at Baleli, about ten miles north-west of Quetta; but the Government of India await the completion of further inquiries before submitting detailed proposals, and I cannot say whether any saving is expected to result. The creation of a military station in the Kurram has never been proposed. I am not at present in a position to say what saving, if any, it will be possible to effect in the near future in the total military expenditure of India. I am now corresponding with the Government of India on the subject, and some points will be considered in the Defence Committee. A considerable ultimate saving is expected to result from the recent reorganisation and redistribution, and I may mention that, as regards special measures connected with reorganisation, the Government of India propose to spend during the current year £600,000 less than under previously sanctioned arrangements they might do. Apart from this, the estimated military expenditure of India for 1906–07 is virtually the same as this contemplated by the Government of India when agreeing to Lord Kitchener's proposals.

Partition of Bengal.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the protests throughout British India, respecting the partition of Bengal, calling for the restitution of the *status quo*, or a modification of the partition, and in view of the dissatisfaction generally with the actions of the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam in respect to the orders issued by him, and his neglect or refusal to carry out in full the directions of the Secretary of State, steps will be taken to ensure that compliance is accorded to the pledges given to the House.

MR. MORLEY: When the situation described in the Question arises, my hon. friend will not find me slow to take such steps as may appear to me to be warranted by the facts.

Salt Tax.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is the present amount of the salt tax now in force in India per pound expressed in English currency; whether it is now lower than it has ever been before; whether, owing to the recent reduction of the tax, the consumption has increased; if so, by how much; and whether the saving per head of the labouring classes amounts to about one day's average wage per month.

MR. MORLEY: In India, exclusive of Burma, the duty is now a little over a farthing a pound. In Burma it is, and has been for some time past, about three-fourths of a farthing. The duty in India has never before been so low. The consumption has increased since March, 1903, by upwards of 11 per cent. The amount of the saving to the labouring classes in India proper cannot be accurately determined. If the average consumption per head be taken at ten pounds per annum, the saving in duty is 2d. per head per annum.

Poppy Industry in Baroda.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the poppy is cultivated in the Native State of Baroda in order to provide opium for the subjects of the Gaekwar; and whether that State enjoys an opium monopoly similar to the monopoly of British India.

MR. MORLEY: The Answer to both Questions is in the affirmative.

Opium in the Nizam's Territory.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether His Highness the Nizam, in whose territory opium is not now cultivated, regularly imports opium into his State in order to meet the consumption of the drug by his subjects; and can he state what quantity during the last year for which figures are available.

MR. MORLEY: I understand that the arrangements described in the Report of the Royal Commission on opium are maintained. The Nizam's Government does not itself import opium, but grants licences to dealers to import it, subject to the payment of duty, from Native States in Central India. In the five years ending October, 1898, the average annual import was 282 chests, of 120 lb. each. No later figures are available.

British Indians in Natal.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Government of India complained of the treatment of His Majesty's Indian subjects by the Government of the late Transvaal Republic; and that these complaints were endorsed by the advisers to Her late Majesty; and whether the Government of India is aware that at present an Indian subject of His Majesty is treated in the Transvaal as a native, in order to exclude him from the franchise and not as a native in order to prevent him from buying land; and what steps the Government of India proposes to take to defend the interests of His Majesty's Indian subjects.

Mr. MORLEY: I am aware of the facts stated. I have no doubt that the Government of India, who are also aware of the facts, will continue to take all steps within their power to improve the position of the Indian population in the Transvaal, and I shall not fail to support them. But the subject, as my hon. friend knows, presents great difficulties.

Poppy Cultivation in India.

Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in order to reduce the area under poppy cultivation in India, in accordance with the Resolutions of this House and the assurances of successive Governments, he will direct the Government of India to adopt the simple plan of gradually reducing the number of permits to cultivators, and at the same time reducing the price paid to them for the raw opium.

Mr. MORLEY: As I stated in this House on the 17th instant,† I am in communication with the Viceroy as to the area for which licences should be granted in the coming season. As for the second expedient of my hon. friend, I hardly see why if the cultivator has a permit he should not be allowed a fair price.

The Swadeshi Movement.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that the publication of a Black-book is announced in Bengal in which the names are to be published of Bengalis and other prominent Indians who have identified themselves with the anti-Swadeshi, and have opposed the anti-partition movement; and whether he will inquire and take such steps as may be proper and possible to protect Government servants from such intimidation for acts done in the performance of official duty.

Mr. MORLEY: I have seen a reference in an Indian newspaper to the preparation of a so-called "Black-book"; but I do not think, at present, that special orders are required. The local Government will no doubt keep in view the necessity of protecting public servants from intimidation.

Protestant Services in Malta.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has communicated with the Governor of Malta with the view of his permission being granted, when necessary, for Protestant services to be held in the theatre under his control; and, if so, with what result.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): The Secretary of State has communicated with the Governor on this question, and the Governor has reported that the Opera House is usually let for a term of years to an *impresario*, and while it is so let, no meeting of any kind can be held without the consent of the lessee. It happened that when the Scottish Church Mission applied for the use of the Opera House one lease had just expired and the new lessee had not yet entered upon his tenancy. The Opera House has now been let for a term of five years from November 1st next, so that it is not possible to give any general undertaking that religious meetings will be allowed in the building in future.

Mr. SLOAN asked whether the Governor had taken upon himself the responsibility of terminating the services.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Opera house was available in a certain sense, because it was not being leased by any private firm. In the interval the Governor allowed the services of the Scottish Mission to be held there. He then suspended the services because of a petition which he received on behalf of the Catholic community in Malta. Their objections were based on the ground that this house had never been used for any religious purpose by any sect, and as it was in effect a Government building it was unfair that it should be used for any religious purpose if not for the advancement of their own religion.

Mr. SLOAN asked whether the Governor's action in withdrawing the permission to hold these services was approved by the Government.

Mr. CHURCHILL: We are absolutely responsible for everything that is done by our agent.

---

† See Col. 26

MR. SLOAN: But had he the consent of His Majesty's Government to stopping the services?

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is it not the fact that in the Blue-book recently issued it was stated that these services were of a proselytising character, and that insulting invitations were issued to the Catholic community?

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): On the contrary, did not the Governor state that they were in no way of an insulting character?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That is a matter on which any one can form an opinion from the Blue-book.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I was protesting against the insinuation of the hon. Member.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Has not the matter been the subject of official correspondence?

MR. CHURCHILL said that considerable negotiations had taken place between His Majesty's Government and the Governor of Malta. A long despatch was received only last night from Sir Charles Mansfield Clarke, and the whole question was now under the careful consideration of the Government. Hon. Members opposite must remember that His Majesty's Government were heirs of the present situation in Malta, and that the conditions existing there were exactly as they were under the late Government. In reconsidering the whole matter they must ask for ample time.

MR. SLOAN said he quite recognised the necessity for ample time. But he would ask whether the consideration of the whole case was with a view to removing the disabilities that were now enforced on the Protestants.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

Religious Processions in Malta.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state why Protestants in Malta are prohibited from holding processions and ceremonies in public, while the right to do so is given and exercised by Roman Catholics.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that public meetings are absolutely prohibited in the town of Valetta?

MR. CHURCHILL: I am aware of a good deal with regard to the situation in Malta. Processions of non-Catholic communities in Malta have hitherto not been allowed because of the apprehension that breaches of the peace would arise from such processions. But the Secretary of State has the whole question under consideration.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Will the Government consider the advisability of making the hon. Member for South Belfast Governor of Malta?

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state when the correspondence between the Government and the Governor of Malta as to the prevention of the Rev. John M'Neill from holding religious services in Malta at the request of the Roman Catholic archbishop will be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has just received a further despatch from the Governor of Malta on this subject, and when he has replied to that despatch he will consider whether it is desirable that further Papers should be laid on the Table.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I understood the hon. Gentleman to give a pledge tha we should have the whole of the correspondence before the Colonial Vote was reached?

MR. CHURCHILL: I certainly gave no such pledge as to the whole of the correspondence. Still we are anxious to give the House every information we can.

The Rand Register.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the circumstantial accusation publicly made by Mr. E. P. Solomon, the leader of the Responsible Party in the

Transvaal, that the Progressives have contrived to place on the voters' roll for the Rand the names of 9,000 persons who had no right to be there in order to gain additional seats in the forthcoming Assembly; and whether before any election takes place, the Government will order an examination into Mr. Solomon's charge, and a careful scrutiny of the voters' roll.

MR. CHURCHILL: This assertion and kindred reports are now engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government, and no statement can be made with advantage on any particular point before the general result of their deliberations can be declared.

The Natal Rising.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any conditions of surrender have been offered by the Government of Natal to the chiefs of the tribes still in rebellion; whether the expansive bullet, known as the Dum-Dum, is being employed by the white attacking troops: how far that explains the heavy fatalities, and especially the large proportion of killed to wounded; and can he say with what weapons the natives are armed.

MR. CHURCHILL: On July 16th the Governor reported that captured rebels had been sent out to induce their tribesmen to surrender and that active measures were being suspended for four days. The bullet employed by the Natal forces is understood to be Mark V. and Mark VI., and the employment of these Marks is in accordance with the practice which prevailed in this country down to quite a recent date. I am not able to answer the latter part of the question, but a good deal of the fighting must be at pretty close quarters.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) asked whether Mark IV. was not the very Dum-Dum bullet that was in question in at least civilised warfare.

MR. CHURCHILL: If the hon. Gentleman means to ask whether Mark V. and Mark VI. are bullets which expand, I have to say that I believe they are.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is it not the fact that in the early stages of the South African War the use of the Dum-Dum expanding bullet was absolutely forbidden after the remonstrance of this House?

MR. CHURCHILL: It is true that, as against a civilised foe, it is most undesirable that the Dum-Dum bullet should be used, and I believe that in the early days of the South African War a good deal of inconvenience was caused by the fact that the ammunition had to be changed.

MR. J. WARD: Is it not within the hon. Gentleman's knowledge that for a certain period during the progress of the war in South Africa, a considerable proportion of His Majesty's subjects seemed to think that even Boers were not civilised?

*MR. SPEAKER: We had better not go back to a question seven years old.

MR. BYLES said the hon. Gentleman had not answered the last paragraph of his Question.

MR. CHURCHILL: I believe the natives are armed with assegais and firearms of a rather primitive and inefficient type.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked the hon. Gentleman whether he had any real responsibility for what was going on in a self-governed colony.

MR. CHURCHILL: Our responsibility in this matter is indirect, and our power of intervention, under existing circumstances, is mainly limited to the tendering of friendly advice.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): Did the arms used by the natives come from Birmingham?

[No Answer was returned.]

Opium Revenue of the Malay Settlements.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether under the system of farming the opium revenue in the Straits Settlements and the Federated

Malay States, any steps are taken to secure that the farmer has not a direct pecuniary interest in pushing the sale of the drug; and whether it is the practice for the Governments of those communities periodically to invite tenders for the farm and to accept the highest bidder, thereby themselves acquiring a direct interest in the increased sale of the drug.

MR. CHURCHILL: The system of farming the opium revenue which is in force in the colony of the Straits Settlements and in some parts of the Federated Malay States is carefully regulated and restricted by law, and it has been held that this system is better adapted to check abuses than direct control by the Government. The opium farm in the colony is periodically put up to tender, and presumably as in the case of other tenders, the Government accepts the most favourable terms. The lessee necessarily has a pecuniary interest in the matter, but the sale and consumption of opium is rigidly safeguarded by law.

Arrest of Chief Kula.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will state if the Chief Kula was arrested when he had obeyed an order to report himself; whether an arrest under such circumstances was contrary to the instructions issued by the Commandant of Militia published in the recently issued Blue-book on Natal affairs; whether the evidence upon which the arrest was made is in the possession of His Majesty's Government; and whether he will inform the House how the Chief has since been treated.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know whether Kula was arrested when obeying an order to report himself. The circumstances of his arrest as far as they are known to the Secretary of State are given in despatches which are included in the Blue-book which will be issued shortly. I find nothing in the arrest inconsistent with the instructions by the Commandant. Inquiry will be made with regard to Kula's present position.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Will the Blue-book be general to South Africa, or will it be confined to the Natal question.

MR. CHURCHILL: It will be general. Whether it will be in one or two columns I cannot say.

Conduct of Native Levies in Natal.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information which he can communicate to the House relative to the conduct of native levies at a recent engagement in Zululand; and whether he will institute inquiries as to the number of prisoners taken in that engagement as compared with the number of killed.

MR. CHURCHILL: I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave yesterday to a similar Question on this subject by the hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs. †

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland): Are these native levies commanded by British or colonial officers?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know whether they are directly commanded by white officers, but of course they are under the control of the officer in charge of the operations, and he is responsible for their actions.

Chinese Amusements on the Rand.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Chinese coolies on the Rand have at some of the mines been organised to play in brass bands, at others to perform Chinese plays; and whether such efforts to provide amusement and recreation for the coolies are receiving the support and encouragement of the Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: I believe that Chinese plays and other similar forms of amusement are organised among the Chinese labourers with the approval of the mine managers. The Government is not specially called upon to take any direct part in the matter.

British Representation in Egypt.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Lord Cromer and the British Judicial Adviser to the Egyptian

---

† See Col. 186.

Government, or either, and, if so, which, are at present away from Egypt and in Europe upon a three months' leave; and whether, in view of the prevailing unrest in Egypt, they are proposing forthwith, or when, to return to their respective posts.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (SIR EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick). Both Lord Cromer and Sir M. McIlwraith are now in this country on the usual leave of absence. If the situation in Egypt became such as to require their presence they would no doubt return.

Charges against British Soldiers in Egypt.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, at the time when the late Captain Bull was found by the patrol of the Army of Occupation at Seresinah, water was being handed to him by one of the native villagers; whether that villager was thereupon killed by the patrol; and whether any proceedings were taken against those who killed the villager, and with what result.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no confirmation of the statement made in the hon. Member's Question. The information obtained by the military enquiry has shown that no charge against British soldiers can be sustained in the evidence forthcoming in connection with the dead body of a native found in this neighbourhood. The investigation is being continued by the Parquet.

Pasova Boundary Dispute.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, considering the commercial importance and the magnitude of other interests involved in the Turco-Persian boundary dispute, and that England is one of the mediating Powers under the Erzeroum Treaty of 1847, His Majesty's Government intend to watch the progress of the Pasova boundary dispute.

SIR EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Government have from the first given their attention to the question of the Turco-Persian frontier, and will continue to do so.

Case of Mr. Stannard.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Governor-General of the Congo Free State has forbidden Vice-Consul Armstrong to act as counsel for Mr. Stannard, at Coquilhattville; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter; and whether he has any fresh information to give the House relative to the progress of the trial.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have received no information to the effect that the Governor-General of the Congo Free State prohibited Vice-Consul Armstrong from undertaking Mr. Stannard's defence. A telegram has now been received from His Majesty's Consul at Boma, according to which Mr. Stannard, who arrived at Boma on the 12th instant, has been sentenced to a fine of £40 and £17 costs, or three months and twenty days imprisonment. Vice-Consul Armstrong was satisfied with the manner in which the trial was conducted. An appeal will be lodged.

Servian Regicides.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Servian Government has communicated to him the exact text of the Decree placing five of the regicides upon the retired list; whether he is aware that such Decree awards them pensions to the amount of their full pay, in recognition of special services rendered to the country; and, whether he is aware that immediately after the retirement of these regicides they were publicly entertained by the Servian garrisons, with the assent of the Servian Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of these matters, and do not propose to inquire into them. The condition throughout has been that the chief regicide officers should be removed from positions in which His Majesty's Representative would be brought into relations with them. That has been done, and it is a condition of the renewal of diplomatic relations that it should be adhered to.

Egyptian Pensions for British Officials.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give particulars of the cases in which, since the British occupation, pensions have been awarded out of the Egyptian revenues to former English officials of the Egyptian Ministry of Finance, indicating the amounts, and the number of years service of the respective pensioners.

SIR EDWARD GREY: There is no information in the Foreign Office, and the matter is one which concerns the Egyptian Government and in which neither His Majesty's Government nor their Representatives exercise influence.

Education of Egyptians.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the number of natives of each sex in Egypt who have been taught to write and read; and what are the percentages of illiterates of each sex to the population.

SIR E. GREY: I have no information on these points, but I will inquire of His Majesty's Agency at Cairo whether any statistics of the kind are in existence.

British Trade in Manchuria.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the Japanese officials are putting every obstacle in the way of British merchandise after it leaves Newchwang, and that there are some thousands of boats delayed pending instruction from headquarters, whilst Japanese goods go in free via Dalny; will make such representation to the Government of Japan as will put an end to this unfair treatment; and will he say when the port of Dalny will be opened free to all nations.

SIR E. GREY: His Majesty's Government have no information to show that the facts are as stated. Inquiry is, however, being made, and the whole question is receiving attention. The Japanese Government have declared that Dalny will become an open port for everybody on September 1st next.

Treatment of Lunatics.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Leeds, I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware of the treatment patients in asylums are subjected to, whether their disease is of a violent type or not; and whether, in view of the repeated complaints made respecting such treatment, particularly in the case of the West Riding Asylum at Menston, he will cause an inquiry to be made by a special court or otherwise at which the relatives of patients may give evidence.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer this question on behalf of my right hon. friend. Neither I nor the Lunacy Commissioners whom I have consulted have any knowledge of "repeated complaints" coming from any responsible sources as to the treatment of asylum patients either in the West Riding Asylum or generally. It is not clear whether the Question refers to the medical treatment of lunatics or to the behaviour of the attendants and nurses towards them. In either case ample means exist for investigating any specific complaints, and if the hon. Member will lay before me or before the Commissioners any facts in his possession, immediate and thorough investigation will be made.

Motor Accidents.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of accidents in the provinces from motor-buses and motor-cars, respectively, during the months of May and June; in how many instances have personal injuries resulted; and in how many cases have such injuries proved fatal.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. Inquiries were set on foot last year by my predecessor to ascertain whether a return of the casualties caused by motor-cars could be collected from the police throughout the country, but it was found that complete figures could not be obtained.

Metropolitan Police and Instruction in Yiddish.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether voluntary classes for the purpose of instructing the police force in the Yiddish language are held in the East end of London; and whether any, and, if so, what encouragement is offered to the men to qualify themselves in this tongue.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir; voluntary classes are held for this purpose. A small sum has been granted by the Home Office for distribution in prizes to men who have made themselves proficient in Yiddish, and such proficiency is taken into account with other considerations in the selection of candidates for promotion.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: Are rewards actually given?

*MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir.

D'Angely Case.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has obtained any further information from the Continent or otherwise concerning the character and antecedents of Madame d'Angely; and, if so, whether he proposes to make the facts in his possession public.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I can make no statement of any sort with regard to the case of Madame d'Angely while it is under the consideration of the Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Police.

Gloucester Level Commissioners.

MR. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has now completed his inquiries into the matter of the constitution and duties of the Commissioners for the lower level of the county of Gloucester; and whether, seeing that there is public complaint of this non-elective body having power to levy rates, he will make an early effort to transfer the powers of the Commissioners to a body having public confidence and being under public control.

*MR. GLADSTONE: This matter is still under my consideration. No complaint of the nature referred to has reached me.

Inspection of the Welsh Mines.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what authority, if any, has he for saying that, in appointing Mr. Atkinson as superintending inspector of the Swansea and Cardiff districts, he perhaps anticipated a recommendation of the Royal Commission.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I said that I had decided perhaps to anticipate a recommendation of the Royal Commission and to strengthen the staff for the whole of South Wales. In saying this I was expressing my personal opinion as to what the Commission might recommend. That opinion I still hold.

Monmouthshire Mines.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department in view of the fact that Mr. Atkinson was appointed superintending inspector of the Cardiff district before any vacancy occurred, on the ground of the special dangers of that district, and that the Monmouthshire and Glamorganshire mines correspond in character, if he can say why it is necessary to wait for a vacancy in the southern district before making similar provision to meet the special dangers of the Monmouthshire mines.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am afraid I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answers I have already given on this subject.

American Leather.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the adulteration of American leathers by ingredients which render the material dangerous to the operatives, whom it renders liable to innoculation with the germs of consumption; and whether he will take steps to check the importation of leathers so treated, in view of the danger to the workpeople who use it or the public who wear it.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The attention of the Home Office has not been called to this matter, but if my hon. friend will communicate to me any information he may have in his possession on the subject, I will have inquiry made so far as possible.

Motor Accidents.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, having regard to the fact that, during the month of June, motor cars and motor omnibuses caused 949 accidents in the London police area resulting in 258 cases of personal injury and seven deaths, will he state whether he proposes to take action at an early date with a view to the better protection of the public, especially bearing in mind that for the month of May the figures were 956 accidents, 231 cases of personal injury, and six deaths.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answers I gave to the Questions which were put to me on this subject last Monday.† The Royal Commission on Motor Cars has just presented its Report, which will soon be in the hands of Members. As regards the Metropolis, the whole Question has been under the consideration of the Select Committee on Cab and Omnibus Traffic under the Chairmanship of my hon. friend the Member for South Wolverhampton. I understand that much evidence has been taken by this Committee, and that their recommendations also will soon be available. I shall then be in a position to confer with my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board as regards any steps which it may be necessary to take in order to deal with existing difficulties. Meanwhile the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police is doing all that he can to mitigate or remove the evils complained of with the powers at his disposal.

Railway Accommodation in Sheffield.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the grievances as regards railway accommodation formulated by the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacture in Sheffield; and if it is possible for his Department to take any steps in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The hon. and gallant Member has himself drawn my attention to this subject by letter to which I am sending him a written reply. The matter is not one that can suitably be dealt with within the limits of an Answer in the House.

Owers Light Ship.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that owing to the refusal of the officials of Trinity House to move the Owers light ship a short distance from its present position, the fishing industry of Selsey is being ruined because the light ship is now so placed as to take the Channel traffic directly over the fishing ground; that the refusal was based on the ground that the place suggested by the local Fishery Board for the new position of the ship was not suitable; and whether the officials of Trinity House took any steps with a view to finding any other place that would be suitable; and what steps, if any, he proposes to take in order to remedy this state of affairs, having regard to the fact that evidence is available to show that suitable anchorage for the light ship exists in the vicinity which would not interfere with the efficient lighting of the coast, and would save the fishing industry from its present threatened ruin.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am informed by the Trinity House as follows:—"In September of last year an application was received from the West Divisional Sub-Committee of the Sussex Sea Fisheries, asking that the Owers light vessel might be moved about three-quarters of a mile to the south-east of her present position. The Elder Brethen after careful consideration caused the applicants to be informed that as the change of the light ship's position as suggested could not, in their opinion, be made without serious detriment to her value as an aid to navigation, they were unable to comply with this request. The Elder Brethren duly considered at the time whether there was any other position to which the light ship could be moved with a view of meeting the wishes of the applicants, and decided in the negative as, in their opinion, if the light ship were shifted farther out it would be necessary, owing to the soundings and nature of the ground in the vicinity, to place her where she would be too far from the shoal to properly guard it, whilst navigating vessels would then be tempted to pass inside her, which would defeat the object the fishermen have in view."

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 1339.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT: Can the right hon. Gentleman arrange for evidence to be heard on this point before the Committee?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Board of Trade have no direct responsibility, but I will communicate with Trinity House, and I have no doubt arrangements will be made.

Board of Trade Reports on Private Bills.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade why an insufficient number of copies of Reports of the Board of Trade on Private Bills are furnished for the use of the Committee on Unopposed Bills; and whether he will take care that this shall be remedied in future.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is the practice of the Board of Trade in reporting to a Committee under Standing Orders on Bills referred to an Unopposed Bill Committee to send whenever time allows four copies of the Report to the Chairman of Ways and Means for the use of the Committee. I understand that in the case of a Railway Bill recently before an Unopposed Bill Committee after being originally referred to an Opposed Bill Committee, the usual additional copies of the Board's Report were, through a misapprehension not sent to a Committee, but I hope that this will not again occur.

West Ham Workhouse Infant School.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the overcrowded condition of the infant school at the West Ham workhouse; if he is aware that there are 119 children in the school, which is constructed to accommodate forty-four; and whether he will at once order the guardians to put an end to such overcrowding.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): My attention has been given to the very serious overcrowding which has existed at this school. The Local Government Board have for a long time been pressing the guardians to make further provision for the children, and the guardians have submitted a plan for acquiring a school which is now under consideration. Meanwhile, temporary measures have been taken. Eighty-seven children have been removed temporarily to another school, and 130 boys have been sent for a short time to a sea-side camp. This will only meet the immediate difficulty, but a Committee of the guardians will recommend them at their next meeting to hire a building for a year to accommodate 150 boys eighty girls and forty infants.

Death from Meningitis at Marlborough.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that an unknown man died of meningitis and starvation on July 7th in a pit close to the main road, and less than a mile from the town of Marlborough; that the presence of this man in an emaciated and dying condition at this place was reported to the police at the police station at four o'clock on that day, and at five o'clock, after inspection communicated by them to the relieving officer, who asked what it was to do with him, and why the police did not take the matter in hand themselves; that no relief or assistance, medical or otherwise, was afforded, nor did the relieving officer visit the place until after eight o'clock on that day, by which time the man was dead; that the relieving officer did not attend the coroner's inquest; and whether he will direct the Marlborough Board of Guardians to hold an inquiry into all the circumstances of the case.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I find that the Marlborough Board of Guardians have already inquired into the circumstances attending the death of the man referred to. I understand that about five o'clock the relieving officer was informed by a police constable that the man was in the London Hill Chalk Pit very ill. He started at once for this place, having ordered a carriage to follow him in order to bring the man to the workhouse. Unfortunately, he had been misinformed as to the place where the man was lying, which was, in fact, in a pit near the Salisbury Hill, which is in quite a different direction from the London Hill.

Owing to this circumstance he was unable at first to find the man; but he twice visited both the London Hill and the Salisbury Hill, and eventually found him. He was then dead. The officer states that from the time when he first heard from the police until he found the man he was continually searching for him. No intimation was given to the relieving officer that his presence would be required at the inquest, and, as he had an engagement elsewhere, he did not attend. The verdict of the jury was that the man died from meningitis. Starvation was not mentioned.

Withington Workhouse.

MR. FULLERTON (Cumberland, Egremont): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has recently been called to alleged defects in the administration of the workhouse at Withington (Chorlton Union), Manchester; whether some members of the Chorlton Board of Guardians have asked for an independent inquiry; and whether he will cause such inquiry to be made.

MR. JOHN BURNS: My attention has been called to this matter. I have not received any application from members of the Board of Guardians asking for an inquiry, though it has been suggested by a firm of solicitors, acting for a former inmate, that an inquiry should be held. It does not at present appear to me necessary that this course should be adopted.

MR. FULLERTON: Does not the right hon. Gentleman intend to send anything more than a formal reply?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will look into the correspondence. If the matter requires further investigation it shall receive it.

Kinder Reservoir, Derbyshire.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the complete stoppage of the works at the Kinder Reservoir, Derbyshire, which were authorised by The Stockport Corporation Water Act, 1901; whether he is aware that such stoppage has resulted in the dismissal of about 400 navvies, causing distress amongst their families; whether he has any information as to the cause of the stoppage; and what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. JOHN BURNS: At present I have no information on this subject, but I have sent a copy of the Question to the corporation, and have asked for their observations on the matter to which it relates.

Promotions of Sorters at the South-Eastern District Office.

DR. COOPER: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General why fourteen sorters at the South-Eastern District Office (exclusive of those who formerly held higher positions and have been reduced) have been passed over for promotion to overseers; whether one officer was put back for signing a petition; whether others, who have acted with apparent satisfaction have been adversely reported upon; whether there has been any allegations against their superior officers by any of these officers; and whether an opportunity will be given to them, if desirous, to qualify at another office, as was done recently in the case of a sorter at the South-Western District Office who was allowed to qualify at the South-Eastern District Office.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Fourteen sorters at the South-Western District Office have been passed over for promotion to overseerships. Twelve of these officers had been tried and either failed or withdrew at their own request. No officer has been or would be put back for signing a petition, nor have any officers who have acted with satisfaction been adversely reported upon. No useful purpose would be served by trying these sorters on overseer's duties at another office. The sorter who was brought from the South-Western District Office to the South-Eastern District Office had been recommended in his own office.

Salcombe Telegraph Service.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the unanimous expression of opinion on the part of the inhabitants of the town of Salcombe, South Devon, he will reconsider his determination to substitute a telephone for the direct telegraphic communication of which the town has had the enjoyment for the past thirty-six years.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The proposed change will not impair—but will rather improve—the telegraph service, and I am not prepared to reconsider my decision. The matter has been fully explained to the district council.

Halfpenny Postage.

MR. BILLSON (Staffordshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will take into consideration the desirability of arranging for invoices, bills, and other business documents carried at the halfpenny postage rate being returned to the sender free of charge when the person to whom they are addressed cannot be found, thus benefiting shopkeepers and other tradesmen.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: It is very inconvenient in practice to discriminate between different kinds of documents sent by the halfpenny post—and I see no sufficient reason for according special treatment as regards return free of charge to the particular documents specified by the hon. Member.

Mail Bag Cloth.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether at the present time the contract for mail bag cloth for the General Post Office is being supplied from the Continent; and, if so, who is the contractor, and what are the advantages over the tenders received from the manufacturers in this country.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: It is estimated that somewhat less than one-fifth of the cloth used for the manufacture of mail bags is obtained from a French firm, and somewhat less than a quarter from a firm who have a part of their supplies manufactured abroad. More than half the cloth comes from a contractor who—as I understand—has it manufactured in the hon. Member's own constituency.

Public Trustee Bill.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General if, in view of the further trustee defalcation reported this week, involving beneficiaries in losses estimated at half a million sterling, he will press on by all possible means the Committee stage of the Public Trustee Bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey): The matter is not being lost sight of. No date has, however, yet been fixed.

Registration of Trades Union Rules.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether having regard to the different interpretations placed by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies and his predecessor upon the definition of a trade union as given in Section 16 of the Trade Unions Act (1871) Amendment Act, he will take steps to obtain the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown on the legality of registering rules of a trade union, containing as one of its objects the promotion of legislation and labour representation.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): In the reply which I gave to my hon. friend on the 26th June last,† I stated that the action referred to in 1901 was taken by the predecessor of the present Chief Registrar presumably upon a different interpretation of his duties under the Act. I have no reason to suppose that any different interpretation was put by him upon the definition of a Trade Union from that put by the present Chief Registrar. The terms of the definition contained in Section 16 of the Act are perfectly clear, and I do not think any advantage would be gained by consulting the Law Officers on the point.

Liquor Duties.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state, for each of the years ending March 31st, 1899, and March 31st, 1906, the total inclusive amount of the net revenue raised from the trade in intoxicating liquors, whether by customs, excise, or licence duties, and whether appropriated to the Exchequer or to local taxation account; the total national revenue raised from all sources in each of those years, whether appropriated to the Exchequer or to local taxation account; and the percentage which the revenue raised from the drink trade bears to such total national revenue in each of those years.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 778.

MR. MCKENNA: In the year ended March 31st, 1899, the total net revenue derived from intoxicating liquors and the trade therein was £38,005,000; of which there was received for the Exchequer £34,548,000, and for the local taxation accounts, £3,457,000. The aggregate revenue raised by the State in that year (including local taxation revenue) was £119,156,000; and the revenue from intoxicating liquors was 32 per cent. of that aggregate. In the year ended March 31st, 1906, the net revenue from intoxicating liquors was £38,134,000; of which there was received for the Exchequer £34,687,000, and for the local taxation accounts £3,447,000. The aggregate revenue raised by the State was £153,633,000, and the revenue from intoxicating liquors was nearly 25 per cent. of that aggregate.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS asked whether it was the fact that the revenue from the drink trade had remained stationary since before the war, while the burden on the rest of the taxpaying community had gone up £34,000,000.

MR. MCKENNA said the statement of his hon. friend was right.

Vaccination of Pupil Teachers.

MR. LIDDELL (Down, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the new education code will permit teachers in the public elementary schools to remain unvaccinated if they have a conscientious objection to being vaccinated; and, if so, whether parents will be allowed to exercise their conscientious objection to the presence of unvaccinated teachers in these schools by refusing to send their children to schools where unvaccinated teachers are permitted to give instruction.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I must refer the hon. Member to Article 11 (*e*) of the code, which sets out with more precision than is possible in an oral reply, the correct answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question. In reply to the second part, I do not comprehend how the objections there referred to can be a matter of conscience; but in any case the employment of an unvaccinated teacher is left in the discretion of the local authority.

Expenses of Religious Teaching.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether all the expenses of giving religious instruction, including the expense of teachers' salaries, heating, lighting, and cleaning, in a school held by the local authority under Clause 10 will be paid by the authority.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): The Answer is in the affirmative.

Teachers' Pensions.

MR. J. H. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Otley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if teachers in non-provided schools, which are continued after the passing of the Education Bill of 1906 as private schools, will be debarred from sharing in the benefits of the teachers' pension scheme.

MR. LOUGH: The provisions of the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, are restricted to certificated teachers in public elementary schools, and I will see that they cover State-aided schools also; but private schools are not included.

Scottish Teachers.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, seeing that under Section 1 of the Statute of 1872 the pupil teacher is an integral part of the Scottish teaching staff, and as such entitled to the grants authorised by that Statute, he proposes to carry out the contemplated abolition of the pupil teacher as part of the staff of any school for grant purposes, by a Minute of the Scotch Education Department or by an Act of Parliament.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Neither under Section 1 of the Act of 1872, nor any section of any other Act is there a statutory obligation to make grants on account of pupil teachers. By Section 67 of the Act of 1872 the rates and conditions of Parliamentary grants are determined by Minutes of the Scotch Education Department made from time to time, and under Section 57 of the same Act it is the duty of the Department to make regulations as to the competency of teachers.

Motor Cars in Sutherlandshire.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the recent introduction of motor cars in Sutherlandshire for the conveyance of mails, goods, etc.; whether he is aware that the main roads are unfit and unsafe for that traffic; and whether he can get the authorities to improve the condition of the main roads so as to make them safe and so that the traffic may be improved.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My attention has been called to the matter, but I am unable to interfere with the management of the roads by the road authority.

Drainage of the Owenmore.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, owing to the periodical flooding of the Owenmore river, in the county Sligo, crops of every kind are liable to annual destruction, and that claims have been made repeatedly on various Governments during the past fifty years for a grant in aid for the drainage of this river, which means the reclamation of 10,000 acres of land; and whether seeing that the Owenmore partly flows through a congested district, and that Sligo has received little or no funds from any Government source in the past, the Government will now favourably consider a scheme for the drainage of this river.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.): It is, I am informed, the fact that the low lying lands near the Owenmore river are frequently flooded in the autumn. The part of the river mainly affected lies outside the congested districts, and for this and other reasons the Congested Districts Board have decided not to undertake any work in connection with the drainage of the river. The Department of Agriculture have also decided that they cannot undertake the desired drainage works; I am not aware of any funds which could be applied to the purpose, but, as the hon. Member is aware, a Commission is enquiring into arterial drainage in Ireland, and it would appear to be desirable to await the appearance of the report of the Commission before considering what may be possible in the matter of new drainage schemes.

Primary Education in Ireland.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he proposes to make any further inquiries, by Commission or otherwise, into the position of primary education in Ireland and the position of the teachers connected with it; and, if not, or in any event when he will be prepared to make an announcement as to the reforms that he admits to be necessary in connection with these matters.

Mr. BRYCE: The Irish Government does not need any further inquiry to convince it that the position of primary education in Ireland is unsatisfactory, but it is quite another matter to feel confident of the possibility of carrying through, under present conditions, the reforms that are needed. I cannot at this moment add to the statement on the subject which I made early in the present session.

Irish Language in National Schools.

Mr. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the speech made by the Most Reverend Doctor Fogarty, Lord Bishop of Killaloe, on Saturday last, when opening the Clare Feis at Ennis; and whether, in view of the words of his Lordship, he will induce the Lords of the Treasury to increase the fees for Irish in the national schools.

Mr. BRYCE: I have perused with interest the speech referred to. The subject of the teaching of Irish will continue to engage the attention of the Irish Government, and communications will continue to pass between the Government, the Commissioners of National Education, and the Treasury regarding it.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware there is widespread dissatisfaction in Ireland with the amount of the grant?

MR. BRYCE: The whole subject is engaging my close attention.

Sunday Band Practice at Geevagh.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a party of police assembled at Geevagh, near Ballyfarnon, county Sligo, on Sunday the 8th instant, and prevented the local band from indulging in their usual Sunday exercise; and will he say by whose authority such action was taken in one of the most peaceable districts in Ireland.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that on the occasion mentioned a force of police was assembled at Geevagh for the purpose of preserving the peace. They had some reason to apprehend that a disturbance might take place. It is, however, not the case that the police prevented the local band from indulging in their usual Sunday exercise. The band practised and paraded the roads without restriction. The police were assembled by the authority of the County Inspector who is responsible for the peace of the district.

Waterford Evicted Tenants.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Guiry, Inspector of the Estates Commissioners, met some evicted tenants of the estate of Mr. J. G. Beresford, near Stradbally, county Waterford, on the 2nd instant, that Mr. Beresford has long since lodged an application with the Estates Commissioners for the sale of certain lands, near Stradbally, under the provisions of The Land Act, 1903, and asking to have them declared an estate; and that Mr. Beresford's representative ordered the inspector to desist from inspecting portions of his estate consisting of evicted farms and untenanted lands; and will he say whether Mr. Guiry's report has been received upon this estate; and whether, in view of the difficulties of the Estates Commissioners in acquiring evicted farms or untenanted lands for evicted tenants if their inspectors are not afforded opportunities of inspecting such lands and reporting upon their value, he will say what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that no change in the circumstances has occurred since this day week, when I replied to the hon. Member's previous Question which was couched in precisely the same terms.† The inspector's report has not yet been received, but the Commissioners will deal with the matter when the sale of the estate comes up in its order of priority.

Ballinrobe and Claremorris Railway.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether in view of the fact that the towns of Loughrea, in county Galway, and Ballinrobe, in county Mayo, are about the same size and contain about an equal number of people; that eight trains enter and leave the former place each day; that only six trains enter and leave the latter place during the same period of time, he will see that the same travelling facilities are given to the people of Ballinrobe as have been enjoyed by the people of Loughrea for many years. I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the character of the accommodation on the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway; whether he is aware that on various occasions several persons travelling between the two places were forced to stand in cattle trucks and vans; that there is no train leaving the town of Ballinrobe later than two o'clock p.m. each day; that the people of that district have repeatedly asked the Midland Great Western Railway Company for better train accommodation without result; and, if so, whether he will communicate with the Midland Great Western Railway Company with a view to inducing them to run a train from Ballinrobe about seven o'clock each evening, and another from Claremorris in connection with the 4.40 p.m. train from Dublin.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No recent complaints have been received by the Board of Trade with regard to the train service on the Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway, but I am communicating the hon. Member's Questions to the Midland Great Western Railway Company for their observations, and will acquaint him with the result.

---

† See (4) *Debates* clx., 1069.

Coolie Outrages in the Transvaal.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether His Majesty's Government have decided to take no further steps between now and the date of the establishment of self-government in the Transvaal to protect the lives and property of the inhabitants from the serious and growing outrages and crimes committed by the Chinese labourers in the gold mines.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): Lord Selborne reports that there is now, as a consequence of the recommendations of the Commission appointed by him to inquire into the matter, more efficient control over the Chinese labourers, and that this is expected to have a marked effect in the prevention of outrages. In his view the best method of preventing outrages is the repatriation of bad characters, a policy which is being vigorously carried out. His Majesty's Government have no intention of abandoning their attitude of vigilance in regard to these outrages, and the High Commissioner is evidently fully alive to the necessity of using every endeavour and all the power of the law for their effectual repression.

Trawler's Certificate Suspension Bill.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the mischief done to line fishing round the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland by illegal trawlers, he will give time for the passing of the Trawler's Certificate Suspension Bill this session.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I informed my hon. friend when he asked me a similar Question on July 2nd,† that I could not see my way to granting facilities for this Bill, and I am afraid that I must adhere to that statement.

*MR. MORTON: Considering the importance of this Bill to thousands of workers I hope the right hon. Gentleman will reconsider his decision. I have not asked a similar Question at all before.

MR. WEIR: Is not this a Bill which affects line fishermen all round the coasts of Great Britain, and is not the Bill really the child of the present Secretary for War when he was in Opposition?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he declined to be the supervisor of his right hon. friend's putative children. The Government had to hold the balance between different measures, and to consider which Bills would occupy the least time. He, however, hoped the Bill would be passed before long.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that every Scottish Member is in favour of the Bill?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am in favour of it myself so far as I know anything about it.

*MR. MORTON: Does not the only opposition come from the great trawling companies or trusts?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not going to be led into expressing any opinion on this thorny question, but I assure my hon. friends who are exercising a sort of competitive pressure——

MR. MORTON: Not competitive.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That I only wish I could give them a more satisfactory Answer.

Public Accounts Committees.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he proposes to give a day or a part of a day, as was done last session, for the discussion of the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I appreciate the reasonable character of my hon. friend's desire; but I do not see any day or part of a day available in this portion of the session, and I shrink from making even the most guarded promises for the autumn session.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1432.

The Army Estimates Debate.

Mr. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the Secretary of State for War gave a definite pledge that ten battalions of regular troops would not be reduced; that the Army Estimates have been discussed upon the allotted days in the belief that this pledge would be observed; that it has not been observed, and whether he will therefore now give a day in order that the proposals of the Secretary of State for War may be discussed with the knowledge that ten battalions are to be disbanded, and before any irreparable action is taken inconsistent with the undertaking given to the House.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said his right hon. friend was going to answer this and similar Questions before Question time was over.

Mr. F. E. SMITH urged the Prime Minister to answer the last part of the Question.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said this matter had been fully before the House ["No"]—he meant the question of interfering with the policy. He was not disposed to depart from what he had already said.

The Natal Rising.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government intend taking any action to put an end to the military operations now proceeding against the native races in Natal, and to ensure that the areas of land now reserved for their use shall not be taken from them.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: His Majesty's Government do not consider that they are called upon to intervene with regard to the military operations which are, it is hoped, practically at an end. They have no reason to suppose that it is proposed to deprive the natives of the areas reserved for their use.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Has it been made clear to the Natal Government that the Imperial Government do not intend to bear any portion of the expense of these operations?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Seeing that we have had no control in the matter, I do not see why we should bear any portion of the expense.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE said that owing to the unsatisfactory nature of the Prime Minister's reply, he should probably ask leave at the conclusion of Questions to move the adjournment of the House.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION..

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I ask the kind permission of the House to make a short explanation on a topic which I think is intended to affect me personally. The right hon. Gentleman, the Member for Croydon, on Monday attended a meeting of the service Members. He went from that meeting and made a communication to the representative of *The Times* newspaper in the Lobby. The question was whether the Government should be asked for time to discuss the Army Estimates further.

> "I declined," he said, "on the double ground that in the first place the Government had already given us three perfectly distinct pledges, all of which they had broken for their own convenience, and that I did not think it either dignified or sensible to ask them for another pledge, which they would probably break in the same way."

I have looked up the only pledges to which I can imagine the right hon. Gentleman refers, and they appear to be these. In a letter which he wrote to *The Times* a day or two previously he specified them. He says——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): On the point of order I do not wish to interfere with the right hon. Gentleman's personal explanation or anything he desires to say. What I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is whether, if he traverses the statement of a right hon. friend of mine, the Member for Croydon, my right hon. friend will not have a right, from his point of view, of also making a personal explanation?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know exactly what the Secretary of State for

War is going to say. If his personal explanation is of a controversial character, I am afraid it will be very difficult to prevent others who think they may be touched by it from making some reply.

MR. HALDANE: It is a very short point, but it does affect me personally, and I think it affects me in a very close way, suggesting that on March 6th I pledged myself against reducing ten battalions of the Line. The right hon. Gentleman referred in his letter to a Question and Answer.[†] Now I draw the attention of the House to this. On March 8th I opened the Army Estimates in a speech in which I pointed out in some detail that battalions at home fed battalions abroad, and therefore I should be guilty of what I said would be an insane thing if I reduced battalions at home, and I alluded to the rumour on which the Question two days previously was founded, and which emanated from Aldershot, that we proposed to reduce ten of the home battalions. My statement was perfectly distinct. It was as follows—

> "There was a rumour the other day in the papers that I had decided to recommend the abolition of ten home battalions of the Line."[‡]

I said that would be absurd. I then went on to point out that, although you could not reduce home battalions, you could reduce battalions in India and the Colonies. I said truly we had decided nothing then. India, as the House knows, we do not propose to touch, but I left it perfectly open to myself to take any course about that; so much so that there was a long debate on the whole thing, taken part in largely by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, as to the policy or impolicy of reducing the Colonial battalions. I only mention this because it is quite clear that the pledge given related wholly and exclusively—if a pledge it was, it was really an expression of opinion to which I still adhere—to home battalions, and had nothing to do with Colonial battalions. To say that I broke my pledge in regard to battalions which are not feeding battalions is to say that which was wholly inconsistent with what I explained to the House.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he wished to ask the Prime Minister a question with regard to next Thursday's Supply. He understood it was the case that Thursday was the third day to be devoted to Irish Estimates, and he had to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to put down the Vote for the salary of the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant on that day. It had been the invariable practice that that Vote should stand in a foremost place. A number of Gentlemen representing Irish constituencies were very anxious to discuss questions which could be raised on the Vote. He entirely agreed with the view that it was the duty of the Government to consider the views of Irish Members generally, but he would also suggest that the minority had a right to have their demands considered by the Government, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would be the first to admit that contention. He therefore asked him to follow precedent in this case, and to put down the Vote for the Chief Secretary as the first Vote on Thursday.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he would like to ask the Prime Minister if it had not been the invariable practice for a great many years—a practice followed by the late Government—to leave it to the Irish Members to select the Votes which should be discussed, and to allow the point to be decided by the majority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that the object of Supply is largely to criticise the action of the Executive Government. No doubt a great majority of the critics of the Government in Ireland are to be found below the gangway, supposing the Irish Government is to be criticised from one point of view only, but there is another section who also desire to have an equal opportunity of laying their views before the House.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University): Is there any precedent in any session for not having the Vote for the salary of the Chief Secretary discussed?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is very difficult for me to interfere between the different sections of the Irish Members. The right hon. Gentleman has no doubt put his case very clearly, but he admits that this is a matter in which we ought in the main to be guided by the feelings and desires of Irish Members generally. My experience has been, so far as Scotland is concerned, that we have been able to come to some arrangement between ourselves on these occasions. We are told there is a small number of Irish Members who particularly wish to have the Chief Secretary's Vote brought forward. So far as my right hon. friend is concerned, he would very much prefer that it should come forward on this occasion so that he might have it out with hon. Gentlemen opposite, but I am bound to state that we cannot see our way to resist the demand put forward by the majority of the Irish Members as to what Vote shall be taken.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 282.

[‡] See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 662.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I trust that the right hon. Gentleman will withhold his final decision on this point. I cannot help hoping that some *modus vivendi* may be arrived at, but if it should not be so, then I ask the right hon. Gentleman before he gives his final answer to consider the claims of the Unionist Members for Ireland on this subject. I admit that they are only a minority of the Irish representatives, but still minorities have their rights, and I think they ought to have an opportunity of criticising the administration.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND asked the Prime Minister to follow the invariable practice—a practice adopted by the late Government—of putting down for discussion in Supply the Votes desired by the majority of the Irish Members.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that a similar case to the present had never arisen under the last Administration.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) pointed out that for a considerable number of years past the critics of the Irish Government had been the Gentlemen who were now the most ardent supporters of the present Administration, and he thought it would be extremely hard if some opportunity were not given to Members who represented fully one third of the Irish population to criticise the action of the Government.

CHARITABLE LOAN SOCIETIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 274.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 274.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 318.]

SUNDAY TRADING.

Report from the Joint Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 275.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. F. E. Smith, Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, rose in his place, and ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the avowed intention of His Majesty's Government to commence forthwith reductions in His Majesty's armed forces which have not received the sanction of Parliament;" and, the pleasure of the House having been signified, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past Eight this evening.

NEW BILL.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend The Church Discipline Act, 1840, and The Public Worship Act, 1874," presented by Mr. Austin Taylor; supported by Mr. David MacIver, Mr. Channing, Mr. Paul, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Sir Joseph Leese, and Mr. Armitage; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 319.]

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

"To amend the Explosives Act, 1875," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Claude Hay and Sir William Evans-Gordon; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 24th October, and to be printed. [Bill 320.]

SUPPLY (17TH ALLOTTED DAY).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.)

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906-7.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £147,470, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board."

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said it would be for the convenience of the Committee if he made a statement on the experience, the course of administration, and the suggested amendment of the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905. This course would save time, and would enable him to indicate generally the best alternative to what otherwise would be a long and tedious and unsatisfactory process of legislation altering or amending a Bill of which they had nine months experience. Before he submitted to the Committee, he hoped for its approval, the proposals of the Government with regard to the suggested amendment of the Act——

THE CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry I cannot allow the right hon. Gentleman to go into future legislation during the discussion on the Estimates in Committee.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he did not propose to go into the question of legislation now. He intended to deal with suggestions in lieu of legislation later on, and only to deal in the meantime with administration pertinent to the Estimates. The Act of 1905, of which they had had only eight or nine months experience, set up eighty-nine distress committees in England and Wales outside London, and they worked under the care and supervision of his Department. Of these, eleven took no action, for various reasons, some because their districts did not justify the institution of public work, and seventy-eight received applications under the Act for assistance or work from 67,000 applicants, of whom only 859 were women. Of this number 50,000 were qualified to receive assistance or work, and 31,000 received assistance or work from various funds. These 31,000 were from a working population of 4½ millions or 1 per cent. of the working population of the areas in which the committees were constituted. Of the aggregate male population of that area, the applicants and workmen who received work were two per cent. There were 17,622 applications rejected, and it was important to note that of this number only 1,639 were rejected because the applicants in the previous twelve months had received poor relief. It had been alleged in connection with the administration of the Act that the regulations were harsh, arbitrary, and inquisitorial. In so far as it was possible by order or regulation or attention to this subject to meet what was reasonable in this charge his Department had done so, he hoped, efficiently and promptly. That was proved by the remarkable fact that of 4,692 applicants in West Ham who received work under the Act, three only were rejected because they declined to provide the necessary information for reasons which he need not go into, but which had more to do with the three applicants than with the regulations. That fact showed that the queries, though numerous, were not so vexatious as alleged, and not unduly inquisitorial, and the fact that the questions were put enabled the authorities to get information and statistics which they could not otherwise have obtained, and which would be of great use to those who studied the problem in future. The ages of those who applied for work were:—Under 20, 2·8 per cent.; between 20 and 30, 26·2 per cent.; between 30 and 40, 28·3 per cent.; between 40 and 60, 36·6 per cent.; 60 and over, 6·1 per cent. Of course, different people from various points of view would put their own interpretation on these percentages. At first blush there was nothing definite or precise to be deduced therefrom, but there was from the trades and callings of the applicants who received work. Generally speaking, the applicants consisted of general, casual, or unskilled labourers. They were 52 per cent. of the whole. The depressed building trade supplied 21 per cent., but casual, unskilled, and general labour, and the building trade combined provided 73 per cent. of the total number of applicants and persons who were provided with work. It was safe to say that the bulk of the men were casuals; they were unskilled, and were camp followers, more or less, of the vast army of labour of which they formed more or less a dependent portion. The largest number of applicants came from West Ham, which had 4,692 applicants, Leeds 3,387, Bristol 2,900, Sheffield 2,352, and Brighton 2,050. In two out of the five districts building, shipbuilding, dock, casual, or general labour were mainly responsible for the bulk of applications from those areas, but in every one of the five the building trade supplied a substantial but varying nucleus of applicants for the fund. The distress committees set up under the Act provided 9,450 applicants with work. The local authorities in existence before the Act provided work for 18,000, or double the number of the new authorities set up under the Unemployed Workmen's Act, while private employers provided 1,800 men with employment through the agency of this particular machinery. The work was of the roughest character—street-cleaning, levelling, excavating, rough drainage, road work, or pick-and-shovel work generally. Some of the work provided by these funds would, in his judgment, have been done by similar men at less cost and perhaps of better quality in a shorter time if this fund and Act had not been in operation. Speaking of the work generally, it could be described as being from "fair" to "bad." Where it was "fair" it took longer and was dearer than in ordinary cases. It wanted more supervision, and these two conditions were frequently brought about by the general unfitness, personal or physical incapacity of the applicants, from lack of resource, initiative, and adaptability to the new task imposed upon them. The general view of those responsible for the administration of the Act was that the class of men who sought its aid were poorer, more dependent, physically less fit men than last year or during two or three years ago. He had visited a large number of the works, and in his judgment the value of the work rendered was from 30 to 60 per cent. of the value that would have been rendered by economically fit men drawn from the best class from which these labourers were recruited. The bureaus set up under this Act were more or less failures, and the labour exchanges were only fairly successful. With regard to emigration and migration, £1,828 was spent in the provinces on 451 persons; and in his opinion this was not the least beneficial part of the operations of this machinery. The finance of the operations by which 31,000 men were given work was as follows:—The seventy-seven distress committees that took action received £18,000 from the rates, by means of the halfpenny rate permitted; £41,000 from the Queen's Fund; £18,000 from public subscriptions; and £2,000 from other sources—or a total of £79,000. The expenditure included £42,481 on work, £6,245 on labour exchanges, £2,465 on farm colonies, £1,828 on emigration, and £1,874 on other purposes—or a total of £54,893. That left a balance of £24,000 either in reserve, allocated, or now in process of being spent. These figures related to what had been done in the provinces. As to London, London had 39,495 applicants for work, of whom only 580 were women. Work was found for 4,612. The wages paid were from 6d. to 7d. an hour to men whom the committee described as being "to a great extent lacking in resourcefulness, energy, and efficiency." But a not inconsiderable proportion were very favourable representatives of their class. For London the Queen's Fund provided £63,000, and the halfpenny rate £25,000, although the total that might have been raised out of the rates was £90,000. In all, £88,000 was spent, of which £40,000 was devoted to work and farm colonies. On establishment £7,000 was spent; and on emigration £3,449, enabling 350 male workers and 841 dependents to be transferred to the colonies. To labour exchanges had been allocated, but not yet spent, £10,728; and a balance of £3,578 was now in process of being spent. It was not unimportant to know how much the Queen's Fund that provided the nucleus of this money yielded. As chairman of the distribution committee he wished to render thanks to Mr. Danvers Power, the secretary of the fund, for the admirable and painstaking work he had done on behalf of the organisation. Out of a total sum of £153,000 raised, England and Wales received £47,000, London £30,000, in addition to £34,000 specially earmarked for the metropolis, Scotland £7,000, and Ireland £6,000. Of the money sent to Ireland hardly a penny had been spent. What were the lessons to be deduced from the working of this Act? In his judgment the best feature was the statistical information and the knowledge and experience that had been acquired during the last eight or nine months. It appeared that from 70 to 95 per cent. of the men who applied for work to labour exchanges or distress committees were casual or unskilled labourers; and the inference to be drawn was that steps must be taken to educate better technically the unskilled labourer, and reduce his numbers to the merest minimum. Then it appeared that the men employed on the last relief works were poorer physically and morally than in previous years. The fact was slowly evolving that the best men, even of the unskilled class, showed an increasing repugnance to relief works, labour exchanges, and eleemosynary aid from public agencies. Another startling fact also emerged—that, whether from poverty, inability, or indisposition, the men who applied for work were in very few instances organised for industrial or provident purposes, by means of sick-clubs, trade unions, or friendly societies. Only one out of 320 applicants at Paddington was a member of a trade union. With regard to the unemployable, for whom perhaps exceptional steps would one day have to be taken, he preferred to concentrate effort on cutting off the sources of supply. But the unemployable were an increasing section of the diminishing ranks of the unemployed. The tendency was for the best men to get together and organise. In many cases, work in small quantities had been given under this Act to a large number of casuals who previously had been intermittently employed, with the result that work of the same kind was taken from better and regular labourers. On that score there had been some complaint. In face of the startling fact that last year 270,000 persons were emigrated from the United Kingdom, many of the remedies which had been suggested for unemployment must be regarded as illusory and futile. But, pending steps to minimise the unemployable class, it did seem that the £6,000 spent on emigrating or migrating 2,250 persons had yielded better results than a sum ten times larger would have yielded if spent on farm and labour colonies. The people who emigrated or migrated were given a fresh start in life without sterilising their capacity, undermining their *morale*, or sapping their independence. But in too many cases men who worked on farm colonies sank back to their original position and were the worse for having gone through a mistaken and even demoralising process. He had looked into this subject. He had been to Hollesley Bay and also to the West Ham labour colony at Ockenden and many others, and the Committee would be pleased to know that, while holding the views which he had just expressed, he intended these experiments to go on in order to see whether after a fair trial they were justified. The site at Hollesley Bay consisted of 1,400 acres of land the price of which was £31,000, and for the purposes of this experiment it was an ideal site, but they must leave it to time to see whether it would be successful, meanwhile maintaining an energetic and firm administration. There was another experiment which he knew appealed very properly to his kindly and sympathetic friend the Member for North West Ham. That was the labour colony at Ockenden to which he had before alluded. The hon. Member knew that the Local Government Board had sanctioned this scheme and had helped it to the best of their ability in many ways in order to secure a fair trial for it also. The Report of the Vagrancy Committee had been submitted to the Home Office and the Local Government Board, but they had found it impossible to deal with it so far. Vagrancy was a phase of the unemployed problem; but the question was a very thorny one to deal with. Some people had suggested that every man who seemed to be without visible means of subsistence and was in working garb should be arrested. He viewed with some suspicion and opposition a suggestion that because a man was a navvy any policeman who suspected him of being a vagrant might intern him in a penal labour colony. He hoped to be able to go into this question during the next two or three months and see what could be done to distinguish between the criminal and the chronic vagrant and the honest labourer and the genuine unemployed. He believed that, however low these people had fallen, they were still susceptible to good advice and kindly treatment. He was not disposed hurriedly to intern them in pauper colonies, in celibate assemblies where they put into practice Aristotle's celebrated *dictum* of the highest form of culture. He thought emigration might be resorted to in some degree, because in some cases it wrenched men from old associations and environment which had an ill effect upon them. Speaking broadly, farm colonies and labour colonies were on their trial. They were not yielding the results that were expected, and there should be a cautious inquiry before they decided on penal or vagrant colonies. He believed that relief works ought to be the last resort of any community. They sterilised volition, sapped self reliance, and introduced into industry those very conditions of irregularity and low pay which they were seeking to remove. Moreover, relief works checked the flow and movement of labour. In his own constitutency 25 per cent. of the working population moved every year to places where the conditions were more favourable. The existence of relief works in a locality frequently prevented men from going elsewhere to look for work. Relief works had been too frequently resorted to by a class of men of whom it might be said, "Once a colonial in a relief colony, always a colonial." He now came to the Act and the Government's suggestions in regard to it. He was not a party to the Act; he had always opposed it, and the more he saw of it the less inclined he was to change his view. But as a public administrator he would sink his private judgment and do his duty fairly and fearlessly in regard to this temporary, experimental, and in his judgment unnecessary Act. No one praised it. The Central Poor Law Conference, who ought to know, by a majority of something like 186 to seventy-two said that the Act should not be renewed, and that a committee of the House should be appointed to consider it before it was renewed. The Municipal Corporations Association had declared unanimously that it should not be renewed in its present form. The Charity Organisation Society was strongly against it, and trade union officials, Labour leaders, and pronounced Socialists were strongly opposed to the measure. He need only quote one or two opinions. Mr. George Lansbury, who ought to know with his experience, said that the Act had caused a great deal of misery, as under it so many were disappointed at not getting work. He now came to his last word on that branch of this subject. The Committee must not forget that as the causes of unemployment were multifarious, so no single remedy, however well-intentioned, however well-devised, could dispose of the problem of unemployment. As the causes were multifarious, so the remedy must be multiform — moral, mental, economic, industrial, municipal, political, and social. If the remedies only created artificial work, that would be bad and mischevious. If the works were State-aided, charity-fed, tax-founded, or rate-subsidised, they would only be a form of public benevolence that would divert the right money in the wrong way to wasteful ends with demoralising results. New works unproductive and unremunerative, fed by rates and taxes, was about the worst form of relief that could be imagined. What they had got to do was to have the old methods, the old works, re-organised, re-distributed, and made more productive, with the higher wages and profits resulting therefrom more wisely spent, with better results to all concerned. Because of that the Government were careful not to do anything this session—and they had taken that course at the request of those who knew most about it—to amend this Act which was temporary, and he hoped transient, till they had the experience of the Report of the Royal Commission upon Poor Law, and that they could only get by allowing the existing machinery to go on. In the King's Speech six months ago the Government promised the amendment of this

Act. That promise they proposed to keep. The Government had, he thought, shown great prescience and much wisdom in postponing their suggested amendment of the Act until this particular moment. If they had taken action earlier they would have been amending in the dark, without knowledge and without experience, and even now they had not sufficient data to warrant a legislative amendment of the Act. He was inclined to take the slower and more deliberate steps of mitigating the temporary difficulty while still searching for a permanent remedy. But the Government had a right in conformity with its pledges to see that the next winter was tided over while the Commission was doing its work and to do what they reasonably could to make this experiment fair and successful. It was not for him to deprecate voluntary effort. They had been greatly assisted by voluntary effort in the past. What were the courses open to the Government? They had upon the Statute Book an Act based on voluntary subscriptions and the limited rate of one halfpenny now levied. The Government were anxious to give the Act a fair trial and to keep the existing machinery alive, and to achieve this end there were two courses open to them. One was to enlarge the halfpenny rate which could be levied under the Act, and the other was to abandon the local rate and to give a grant, whilst the Act was an experiment, from the Consolidated Fund. They had chosen the latter and, as he thought, the wiser alternative. The Government were influenced in coming to this decision by the consideration that the local rate, even if it were expanded, would be spent only in the district in which it was raised, in many cases whether the money was wanted or not. That would be unscientific, wasteful, and absurd. The grant, which would be under the control of the Local Government Board, would be voted to existing district committees, not in accordance with the demands that might be made from each of the particular areas now constituted, but in accordance with the necessities of the district. The grant would be disbursed by himself, and he could promise the Committee that there would be less waste in its distribution than there had been in the case of some of the money that had been spent during the past twelve months. It was proposed that the grant should be a sum not exceeding £200,000. That was larger than the Queen's Unemployed Fund of last year, and considerably more than was raised from voluntary contributions and the rates under the Act. With the rate-raised money and the voluntary contributions there would be an amount available of anything from £300,000 to £400,000, and that, for a temporary purpose, while the whole subject was being inquired into by the Royal Commission, was in his judgment quite sufficient. If it was not sufficient, his comment must be that a better remedy must be found, not in raising more money to be spent in this way, but in other more excellent ways which were within the purview of the Government. The poverty of the unemployed and the distress of the district would be alone considered, and the Local Government Board, in conjunction with the Irish, Scottish, and other Departments, would see that this money was promptly and efficiently used. But this was the Government's proposal only in regard to this particular Act. They considered that better remedies for the unemployed could be and were provided in many ways, such as the Irish Labourers Bill. That Bill, by spending £4,250,000 on 28,000 cottages and plots of land in Ireland, would deprive the now unemployed labourers of Gateshead, Newcastle, Brighton, and London of the competition to which they succumbed of the stronger and healthier men who would henceforth be kept in Ireland. The Government proposed to do a similar thing in regard to rural housing, subject to the Committee thereon for England and Scotland; they were also considering such questions as small holdings, allotments, and Crofters Amendment Acts. They had appointed a Coast Erosion Committee, and a Commission on Canals. He was personally giving attention, with the sympathy of the London dock directors, to see whether something could not be done as speedily as possible to prevent places like West Ham, Poplar, and the East-end of London from being permanently burdened and cursed with the casual conditions of dock labour which were a reproach to every one concerned. When they considered that more men were discharged from the Army, Navy, and Militia every year than the total number of men who secured work under this Act, they as a Government felt they had something to do. The Secretary for War recognised the importance of the winter training of Militia, the helping of ex-soldiers to employment, and allowing reservists to have their reserve pay if they went to the Colonies. He was doing his best to advise local authorities to co-operate with them in raising the standard and organisation of the unskilled labourer. He advised all municipalities which had large tramway undertakings, and had money to spare from them, as many had, to give it not so much in higher wages as by the institution of a six-day working week, so that men from the ranks of the unemployed might be absorbed and the present staff not be overworked, and have too much Sunday labour, which too frequently many of them had. His work in connection with the unemployed had given him a busy time, and his officials, he was sorry to say, had been overworked in helping him to bring forward the proposals he now submitted. He asked sympathy and support for the Government's interim proposals and for all the proposals which during the next four or five years they intended to submit, with the object of helping the industrial soldier upon whom the marks of misery and of poverty too frequently fell, and never so hard as when he was in the ranks of the unemployed, or an unwilling recipient of eleemosynary aid in whatever form.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he hastened to assure his right hon. friend that in the programme he had outlined in the latter part of his speech he would receive the wholehearted assistance of the Labour Members. They might differ from his right hon. friend on some details, but not on the broad principles. In his refusal to legislate by amending the existing Act, and his proposal to deal with the unemployed administratively, as well as in his criticisms of relief works, so far as these criticisms went his right hon. friend had their wholehearted support and sympathy. The failure of the Unemployed Workmen's Act was, he thought, to a large extent its justification. He had been a member of the central unemployed body for London practically since its beginning, and he was now chairman of one of its committees. The experience he had thus gained had been to a very great extent heartrending. He believed he was speaking the mind of the great majority of his colleagues when he said they believed that the very fact of that revelation having been so heartrending placed more responsibility on this House to face the problem and study and settle the whole question. Let them take for instance, the question of relief works. It was true those works up to now had probably contributed more evil than good, although there was no doubt they were absolutely necessary in the circumstances in which they were created. But his point was that in fixing labour when it ought to be fluid, in making labour look to artificial means of support when pressure ought to be used to induce it to look to ordinary economic means of support, and in taking action merely to meet the immediate needs of the moment they had been undertaking experiments which from the point of view of social organisation had very largely led to evil. The moral was, not that there should be no relief works, but that the machinery for dealing with exceptional unemployment should be created before such unemployment had to be faced. What sort of legislation was possible if they waited until they saw these miserable processions of men asking for their alms and trying to get at their hearts? Neither their legislative nor their administrative experiments under those circumstances would contribute permanently to the social amelioration of the country. His appeal to his right hon. friend therefore was to remember always that the energy of his department should be bent towards creating some machinery which could be practically shut down when it was not required, and put into full operation again in a very short time. He did not place so much reliance as his right hon. friend did upon statistics. He had gone through a considerable number of the Record Papers from which these statistics had been compiled. There was not a member of a committee who was responsible for classifying skilled and unskilled labour but must have felt that he was doing some injustice. Unskilled, yes; but they had been working in a variety of occupations. They were unskilled in operations in which probably every Member of this House, or nearly every Member, was unskilled. They had been doing labourers' work, wheeling barrows up narrow planks, or engaged on dangerous dock work. They had been assisting more skilled workers, but assisting them in such a way that was absolutely essential if the great machinery of industry was to go on. Unskilled workmen, yes, but the unskilled workman was as necessary for industry as was the skilled workman. If when depression came the unskilled labourer was first of all to go upon the streets and seek refuge in the employment bureaux they did him an injustice, if they regarded him as someone who had only slender claims upon society—more slender than the skilled man. They had a false view of their responsibilities and national conditions if they simply put that man down in the group of unskilled workers and quoted him amongst the 70 to 95 per cent. of the applications of unskilled labourers who did not deserve much sympathy. But those figures were most fallacious. He had in his possession an elaborately got up table regarding the effect of the Unemployed Act, and he found that in Birmingham the applicants for work who were skilled numbered 25 per cent. (His figures did not quite agree with those given by the President of the Local Government Board.) The percentage of skilled workmen amongst the applications in Bristol was 28 per cent., East Ham 37 per cent., Leicester 80 per cent.—and that was owing to the introduction of machinery in the town which he was trying to represent, where an industrial revolution was going on similar to that which took place in the cotton trade 150 years ago—Walthamstow 30 per cent., Wolverhampton 25 per cent., Bolton 2 per cent., Cardiff 12 per cent., Manchester 40 per cent., and Poplar 33 per cent. It would be seen that the variation was exceedingly great. What they had to remember was that any attempt to deal with the unemployed, whether by legislative or administrative effort, must be preceded by an attempt to differentiate between the kind of unemployed. It was no good saying to a skilled worker, "We are going to put you upon a farm colony." The hypothesis of this Act was that the people to be benefited under it were only temporarily out of employment. The skilled workman out of employment for a week or two would not accept aid from a distress committee. If he happened to be a trade unionist he would come upon the union funds, and if he was not a member of any trade union he would probably try to borrow money or live upon the charity of his old mates who, as a rule, were divided only by the very thinnest partition from his own deplorable condition. Only when such a man had abandoned all hope of being able to see the inside of a factory within a tolerably short space of time would he come before distress committees and ask to go to Canada or Hollesley Bay or appear in the highways as an ordinary street sweeper. The Local Government Board had to discover some means by which skilled and unskilled men who had not abandoned all hope of getting into work within a short period of time might be aided without having to go to a distress committee. Then, in regard to London, the statistics of unemployed women were absolutely fallacious. There were scores of women in the Borough of Holborn and the City of Westminster who ought to have been helped who did not even know that they were beneficiaries under this Act. There was no section of the community that ought to be more readily and carefully helped than the unmarried women who had to earn her own living, honestly if they could. Then there was the case of the widow with a young family who had to leave her children during the day in order to earn a little bread and cheese for them. Those were the general observations he desired to make. He was glad that the President of the Local Government Board had been a little more sympathetic towards farm colonies to-day than in the past. He did not share the glowing views as to the beneficial operation of farm colony experiments which some people held, but he did look upon them as a substantial contribution to solving the unemployed problem. They could not expect a farm colony to succeed under six or seven years. At present they were groping their way in the dark. When they sent a man down to a farm colony they often had to place him upon pasture land or abandoned land. They gave him a spade, set him to dig a hole, and then got him to fill it up again. That was discipline, and the men had all to undergo the experience of having their hands blistered. It was the A B C of farm work that a man should be able to dig a hole and fill it up again. That was the reason why Hollesley Bay had not given the boundless measure of satisfaction which it might do after it had been in operation a few more years. Let them give the farm colonies time. They welcomed the grant for the Consolidated Fund in the most hearty way. He was delighted that there was to be no amendment of this Act, and that the policy which had been adopted was to enable distress committees to carry on their work during the next winter. He hoped that from the experience that would be gathered the result would be that when the amendment of the Act did come about it would be a new organisation, lock, stock and barrel. Were they to understand that this grant was only going to be guaranteed for twelve months? His right hon. friend knew full well that the great value of this assistance to those who would have to distribute it would be to have some guarantee that it would not suddenly be brought to an end. Were they to understand that it was in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman simply to carry on the work of the distress committees as now established until such time as the Government had an opportunity of reconsidering the whole question either in the light of the Report of the Poor Law Commission or of the experience that would be gathered in the meantime? He hoped the change would come before the Poor Law Commission reported. One could hardly hope that the Report of that Commission would be laid upon the Table of the House before the end of five years; but before that time had elapsed he hoped they would have a Bill brought in carrying into effect the recommendations of that report.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The Report is expected in two or three years.

***MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD** said he was afraid that he could not indulge in that optimism, but whilst the change of which he had spoken was being contemplated might they regard it that this grant would be given from the Consolidated Fund properly guarded and with sufficient generosity and regularity to enable them to carry on such good work as they were able to do with the machinery at their disposal? The general question of unemployment would, of course, have to be brought up when the various proposals which his right hon. friend had outlined in his speech were submitted. For the present he contented himself with saying that any support that might be necessary from the Labour Party both inside and outside the House would be given to the main features of the proposals to support the Distress Committees which had been placed before the Committee by the President of the Local Government Board.

MR. WALTER LONG said that as he was instrumental in carrying through Parliament the Act which had been criticised by the President of the Local Government Board, and as he was responsible for that Department for three or four years, he wished to say a few words on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman had not been quite as generous as he might have been to his predecessor in office. His memory took him back to the debates on the unemployed question during his own term of office and that of his predecessor, but never had there been an opportunity for such a practical debate as they had had to-day, and never had a Minister been in a position to give to the Committee greater information and experience. The right hon. Gentleman had opened his mind to the Committee as to the reforms and the remedies that he hoped to introduce. Of course, it was a mere platitude to say that the problem of the unemployed was not going to be dealt with by one single remedy or attempted solution. He was not going to quarrel with the general policy of the Government, but he said emphatically that all the hopes held out to them this afternoon and all the suggestions of policy for the future in regard to the housing problem, small holdings, allotments, or advances of money for other purposes could only apply—wise and well-considered though they might be—to the reduction of the problem many years to come in the future. When the present Act was introduced for dealing with unemployment the Government were face to face with a problem which pressed for immediate treatment. He admitted that that Act was not complete in its form, for, as had been said by the hon. Member for Leicester, who spoke with much knowledge of this particular subject, if they left the treatment of this question until it had assumed an acute form in the winter when unemployment was, of course, more general, they would find themselves absolutely unable to deal with it. Then followed processions in the streets, clamorous, and in many cases piteous appeals to the boards of guardians, and the inability of these boards to deal with the question. The boards of guardians, it should be remembered, were not constituted to prevent men from becoming paupers by bridging them over the time of difficulty. They were only entitled by law to relieve those who were destitute, and the immediate result of the relief, which might be of the most temporary character, was to make them paupers. Experience showed that when once people found their way on to the poor law or into a workhouse it was ten times harder to reform or regenerate them and bring them back to the position of self-supporting citizens. Apart from the boards of guardians there were the municipal councils, and whatever might have been the waste and misapplication of money under this Act, there was no waste so great as there had been under the old municipal system of turning on crowds of men to do work that was not necessary, without supervision or attempt at control. The President of the Local Government Board had said that some of the money which had been spent would have been well spent on migration and emigration. That could hardly have been realised until they had a central authority such as was established under this Act of Parliament. Before then there was no competent body to deal with emigration. The only powers were those possessed by the boards of guardians, and the countries to which they emigrated people told us that they were tired of that system of emigration. While these countries were willing to take respectable emigrants who were not sent out under pauper auspices, they were not prepared to take those sent by the poor law authorities. There fore, if there had been no other return from this Act of Parliament than that he thought it had worked well in that respect and done something worth having. For the first time the President of the Local Government Board had been able to present a statement to Parliament showing that to this class belonged many of the applicants for special assistance. Before the passing of the Act there was no statutory authority who could do this work. What happened? The winter came on and the pressure of the unemployed became greater, until at last it was impossible to turn a deaf ear to their appeal and they were dealt with either by the boards of guardians or the municipal authorities. When he was President of the Local Government Board the boards of guardians, not only of London but of the provinces, came to the Board with piteous appeals for advice as to how they were to proceed in the difficulties in which they were placed. They knew that many of the applicants were respectable men able and willing to work, and that it was a cruelty to turn them on to the poor law. They came forward with various municipal works and employed these men on them. A great many men so employed were by nature, training, or physical debility unsuited for it, and they were not able to give a full return in the shape of work for the money paid to them. He ventured to say that the experience that had been gained should be made use of. One result ought to be to improve the condition of the workers. We ought to be able not merely to give these men work for a time and then let them slip back into the abyss of unemployment, but we ought to pass them on to permanent work, stronger in body and mind, if they were properly supervised in the meantime. He was very glad to hear what the right hon. Gentleman said about the Hollesley Bay experiment. As the hon. Member for Leicester truly said, he must be a very unwise or very ignorant person who was prepared to pass judgment on farm colonies when they were only a year or two old. Farm colonies were only a small part of the experiments they were making. He was very glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman was giving careful attention to the Report of the Vagrancy Committee appointed by the late Government. He believed the vagrancy question called for prompt treatment, although this was a free country, and he should be reluctant to apply primitive methods. But he said emphatically that, in the interest of the working men of the country and all those who by adversity became unemployed, it was essential that this vagrancy question should be dealt with firmly. There were a numerous class of vagrants wandering about the country making their living by the terrorism which they inflicted on poor residents in lonely districts. The law was not sufficiently strong to deal with them at present, and he hoped the Report of the Committee would enable the right hon. Gentleman to deal with that part of the difficulty. The right hon. Gentleman had further said they were not going to deal with the difficulty only by legislation. He had said the remedy for the difficulty must be more extensive than anything to be found in the Unemployed Act, and had proposed better distribution of capital and its proceeds. One remedy should be not only that labour should be paid a fair wage, but that there should be more regular, more certain employment for working men. Undoubtedly they would have from time to time, quite apart from the vicissitudes of trade, surplus amount of labour. If they were not going to provide machinery to prevent that surplus labour being turned into pauperism, then they would be satisfied with a very insufficient solution. God knew that we must expect the creation of pauperism out of physical weakness, immorality and drunkenness, but we were also putting into our workhouses a considerable number of persons not intended for paupers. We were making paupers of men who were willing and anxious to be self-supporting citizens, and so long as it could be said that that was the case we ought not to be content with our existing powers of dealing with the difficulty. He was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman was not going to amend the Act at present. It was an experiment, because it was impossible for any body responsible for poor law administration to hold his hand and do nothing. The right hon. Gentleman was quite right in not undertaking any reform of the Act until we knew more than we did at present. He saw no reason to quarrel with the right hon. Gentleman for the alterations he had made in the financial arrangements. It would spread the burden of the cost over a very much wider area and it would probably have the effect of preventing unnecessary expenditure and possible extravagance in certain districts. He thought the action which the late Government took at the time was justified by the circumstances of the time. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had thought it right to make a certain quotation. Anyone who was then in Parliament would acknowledge that not much popularity was obtained by the Minister in office at the time. His own friends regarded the Bill with suspicion; and his political opponents thought that he had not gone far enough. The right hon. Gentleman must know that what he would call the spade work had been done in the time of the late Government. He could assure the Committee that when the Bill was introduced last year there was no idea of courting popularity. It was because circumstances demanded action. Although, no doubt, they had much to learn in regard to the solution of the unemployed problem, he believed that the Act of last year was a wise and prudent measure which had been justified by its results. It certainly enabled them to approach the problem of the unemployed better equipped than they would have been had not the Act been passed.

MR. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.) said he did not wish to disturb the harmony which seemed to prevail in regard to the speech and action of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board; but he should like to pay a tribute to what had been done outside the House of Commons for the unemployed and to the sound assistance given them in that regard by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin. Those interested in this question looked with the utmost interest to the Bill dealing with unemployment, first introduced last year, but that Bill was withdrawn and another introduced and practically passed in one afternoon. The general result, he contended, was that things were worse than if no Act had been passed at all. He respectfully congratulated the President of the Local Government Board on the method he proposed to adopt in regard to the amending Unemployed Act. He was quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman had chosen the only possible and practical way. Without a provision of machinery and funds for dealing with this question it would have been offering a stone instead of bread. He thought it was a great thing that the principle of national responsibility to provide for the unemployed had been accepted by the Government. He was not sure that the money to be provided was anything like sufficient. As a matter of fact, the difficulty had been not so much in obtaining funds as in securing employment for these men. He need not say anything more than had been stated by the hon. Member for Leicester on the question of relief committees. He believed that the system of temporary relief was bad. In some boroughs where the municipality had provided three days work in the week in the winter it had done harm rather than good. Most hon. Members were familiar with the kind of thing which had been done. There had been a substitution of hand-sweepers instead of horse-sweepers in the streets. Anything more grotesque he could not imagine. Then, in one part of the East End of London, on Wanstead Flats, men were set to dig up the ground for planting potatoes, and at another time to making cricket pitches. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board would give the Committee some idea as to the method by which this grant of £200,000 was to be administered. There was, he was glad to say, a revival of trade, and he was hopeful that the unemployed committees would have their labours diminished; but he knew that in West Ham, Tottenham, and other parts of greater London and also in some Northern towns there were still a large number of unemployed, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would assure the Committee that the grant would be distributed according to some settled scheme. One of the most vicious forms of municipal enterprise was an attempt to solve the unemployed problem by giving a few days employment during the winter months. He hoped that the £200,000 would be given under different conditions than those which applied to the £153,000 last year. The expenditure of that money no doubt diminished to some extent the sad results of the unemployment which then prevailed; but so far as a rational, social experiment was concerned, a great deal of the money was wasted. Much of the work done was useless, and it was done at an increased cost of from 80 to 100 per cent. One or two suggestions had been made in these distress committees that something permanent should be done, but the answer was that they had £1,000 thrown at their heads that day and £1,500 to-morrow, and they had not secured the permanence which was desired. As one who was responsible in a measure for the West Ham farm colony, he claimed that that was the one piece of permanent work done under the existing Act. He wanted to see ten or twenty more colonies established during the coming winter, where men could be taught to like country life, and trained in agriculture for the colonisation of England. He rejoiced in the partial conversion of the President, and begged him to remember when he was formulating schemes for spending the £200,000 not merely the transitory relief given to the unfortunate labourers, but that they were engaged in a real social experiment which, if it succeeded, would give us the key to a problem which had been exercising social reformers for a very long time.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said that while he had not wished to intervene in the debate in existing circumstances—he had come down in defiance of his doctor—he felt compelled to do so. As far as the Act of the last Government was concerned he was delighted with it, and he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin on the moral courage with which he had stood up against difficulties in promoting the measure. It was absurd to say the Act had done no good; £200,000 had come out of it that afternoon. Many and many a home had been kept which would have been broken up to-day but for that Act. If it had only saved ten men the nation ought to be proud of it. There seemed to be a notion in the mind of the President that nothing could be done for the existing unemployed, but he pressed the question—What were they going to do with the men who were craving for a living now? They must do something to stop the rot, considering how soon men deteriorated and became unemployable when they could find no work to do. A man must have some work to keep his eye in and his muscles at work. The distress committees, however, had not acted on that principle. But, after all, what had they to offer the people? There were 39,000 applications for work in the county of London and out of that number 4,000 got work. That was one out of ten. What became of the others? The Charity Organisation Society, of course, said—"Let them alone, because if you provide a man with work, you sap his independence, and therefore it is better to let him rely on himself." Of course, if that policy was adopted, in the end a coroner's inquest would be held and that would settle the whole question. Under the old-fashioned system of keeping poor law children in the workhouse, as was proved by the figures of the Charity Organisation itself, for generation after generation the people came back to the workhouse. When, however, a better system was established and the children were treated as human beings, as they had been for sixteen years, they took their share in the world's work. To-day scores of people who were occupying responsible positions came from the workhouse. As to the poor law conference he had no more faith in their decisions than he had in those of the Charity Organisation Society, although no doubt they were very good for finding out impostors. But the impostors were very few; perhaps they might find one in a hundred, but the other ninety-nine were deserving of help to obtain employment. What he wanted to know was what the Government were going to do with the able-bodied unemployed. They must do something, and it was folly for the President of the Local Government Board to argue that nothing could settle the question. He wanted organisations to organise work which should not be unproductive. The worst kind of toiler even wanted to feel that he was earning his daily bread, and they could not keep a man for long at digging a hole and then filling it up again. Every man liked to see some result from his labour. They must try to keep the manhood in a man and should protect a man as soon as possible after he was out of employment and help him to get work. A man as he had said, soon became unemployable, and an employer would much rather take on a man who had been out of employment a week than a man who had been out of employment for three months, even if the latter came with a clergyman's recommendation. The employer knew that if they were out of employment for three months their hands would be soft and they would not be able to wheel a barrow of muck properly. For many years they had had deterioration in the workhouses. What he asked was that they would help these men to retain their manhood; that directly a man got out of work they should find him some employment. There were four classes to be dealt with. First, there was the vagrant who could be easily dealt with. He would keep him under control and he would steal his children. He would see that they were not dragged about by the vagrant. Another class that might be difficult to deal with was the able-bodied pauper. The able-bodied pauper was a man who would loaf about the house and get fat. He did not want to work. He knew more about the poor law than all the guardians put together. It was wonderful what an amount of intellect lay dominant in an able-bodied pauper. The so-called unemployable ought not to be at all difficult to handle if the Local Government Board brought its power and capacity to bear upon the question and insisted upon there being a real opening for real work for the able-bodied pauper to take up. It was the able-bodied pauper that generated the unemployable. He would take the so-called unemployable, scrub him, get him clean, put him on a suit of decent clothes, take him into the country and start him at the work of turning over the ground. When a good man was thrown out of work there was nothing that he would turn to quicker than the land. Put him on to a farm colony or a farm college, let them call it what they liked, it meant the same thing. He might get a little discontented with the old country, but he would be fit then for emigration. If they did spend £100 upon him they would at least have preserved his manhood and the womanhood of his wife and saved his family. Parliament could settle everything very easily here, but hon. Members never came forward to see what the problem was like at close quarters. Let them imagine for a moment the effect of the closing of a works and the throwing out of a large body of men. It was said that boards of guardians made paupers. That was not so; it was the employers throwing men out of work that made the paupers. All that was left to the guardians was to feed them. They had men like those he had described, brave men who would sell and part with everything they had rather than expose their poverty to a distress committee or the poor law guardians, and he rejoiced that in spite of all the luxury that some of the boards of guardians had given to the applicants that the applicants still hated it and would not come till forced. A man must be hard up and hungry and pretty low down when he came to his (Mr. Crook's) door as one did last Saturday morning and said—

> "Can you find us a job, Mr. Crooks?" "No, my lad, I am sorry I can't." "Do you see that little chap on crutches? I have five like him at home, and we are hungry and have not broken our fast yet. Am I to be obliged to go to the relieving officer and take those little dots to the workhouse because I am unable to get work?"

It was quite easy to look at these matters at Westminster, but it was a little difficult when one had to meet them at Poplar and see the man and his starving family. He appealed to the Committee to back up the proposals of the President of the Local Government Board and to have no fear. We live in an enlightened age, and the poor knew the cause of their poverty. He wanted to try and help them to keep their manhood. Would the Committee help them to do it? The time had gone by when men could say, "Poor man, God help you, for we cannot." They had a Minister at the Local Government Board who knew what all this meant, and he rejoiced that the right hon. Gentleman was going to make an effort to preserve the manhood and the womanhood of the nation.

*MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham) said it appeared to him that the Committee was discussing what he, to a large extent, would call palliative measures for the solution of the problem of the unemployed. It seemed to him that the unemployed difficulty was due in the main to two causes. The first was the unequal distribution of wealth, and the second the unequal distribution of population. It would take too many hours to discuss the former, but it was advisable to call attention to the fact. One of the greatest difficulties the President of the Local Government Board would have to encounter in this matter was the unequal distribution of population. He was extremely glad to notice that in the course of his statement the right hon. Gentleman made reference to the fact that he was trying to take some action with regard to the dock labourers in the East End of London. The right hon. Gentleman understood as well as anybody could that the state of things in East London was largely due to the 20,000 casual labourers who existed there. If they could eliminate those labourers from East London they would have gone a great way towards solving the problem of the unemployed in that district. There was a flowing and ebbing tide of population in the East End of London. There was the flowing tide from the agricultural districts coming in through Canning Town and the ebbing tide of casual labour from the older districts of East London. The result of this was most particularly noticed in West Ham, which had been the storm centre of unemployment for many years past. He had had a great deal to do with this question in West Ham, and he had passed some very hard winters there and had had to work from early morning to twelve o'clock at night for weeks at a time.

One of the first things the President of the Local Government Board had to do with regard to East London was to attempt to eliminate the casual labour which existed there in such immense quantities. Might he make one or two suggestions with regard to dock labourers? He believed it was possible, supposing the directors of the dock companies were willing, to form a permanent staff for the whole of the docks, so that there would be no casual labourers at all. By means of the telephone and the telegraph they could concentrate the labourers in any one dock just as occasion required. Then he would suggest that the casual labourers be taken out of East London. While they remained there they only complicated the problem. Deterioration in working class life set in immediately labour became casual. Nothing more demoralising could be imagined than having to wait hour after hour at the dock or factory gates in the hope of finding work, which was only to be obtained once in a dozen times. And yet they expected these men to be honest and honourable citizens, and pay their rent and debts. It was absolutely impossible. The only thing that could be done was for the President of the Local Government Board to bring his influence to bear on the dock directors, or by some other means to form a permanent staff at the docks, and then distribute the casual labour. That was the explanation of all the difficulties that now confronted relief committees. How could they have classification when there were thousands of casual labourers in East London and elsewhere complicating the problem? And yet classification was at the root of the matter. They could not classify until this large casual element was eliminated. He was very glad to hear the reference of the President of the Local Government Board to the question of organising on a permanent basis the casual labourers of East London. Nothing better could be done. They talked about permanent remedies. A great many of the remedies that had been suggested were not and could not be permanent. It was no use putting men to work for a few weeks at a time, with the knowledge that at the end of that time they would fall back into the old rut. What was wanted was some form of permanent work if possible. He had always felt that what they had to do was if possible to create a new trade. He only knew of one that could be started in England and employ a large number of men and be profitable, and that was afforestation. All the evidence was on his side so far as Departmental Reports and Commissions were concerned. Afforestation was one of the most important industries in the world. Germany had shown what a large number of men could be employed and maintained by this occupation; and though he did not contend that in England it could be done to the same extent, he did say that there were 10,000,000 acres of land in the United Kingdom suitable for the purpose, and it would be a great blunder if they were to overlook the possibilities of this form of industry. It was estimated by a very eminent expert that if we had allowed Ireland to keep her own forests, and had not allowed certain landlords and land-grabbers to denude the land, the forests would be worth at the present time at least £100,000,000 sterling. He did not ask the President of the Local Government Board to make a large experiment to start with, but in conjunction with the Minister for Agriculture and the Commissioners for Woods and Forests, some experiment might be made in this direction following on the recommendation of the Departmental Committee. Then there was the matter of labour bureaux. Up to the present, discussions inside the House and outside had all gone on the assumption that the facts were known. Until quite recently, however, we knew nothing like the facts, and even now we did not know how many unemployed there were in England within a hundred thousand. We could only come to an approximate conclusion. If labour employment bureaux could be established in London on a scientific basis—such for example as those in Germany or Copenhagen—it would greatly aid the President of the Local Government Board in his endeavours to arrive at a solution of the problem. In Munich the year before last, through the agency of the labour bureau, 83,000 applications were received for situations, 63,000 situations were offered, and 50,000 situations were filled. He could mention half-a-dozen other instances equally striking. What had been done in London? If they examined the reports of the various bureaux established up to the present time, they would almost be able to count on their fingers the number of men and women for whom employment had been found.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said there was one important difference between England and Germany. If it were only known how many situations had been secured by trade unions in this country it would be found that they did the work.

*MR. ALDEN said that was perfectly true, but there were an enormous number of men out of work who were not in the trade unions.

MR. J. WARD: That is a fact.

*MR. ALDEN said he frankly confessed that his sympathies were with the trade unionists, but at the same time he also wanted to see non-unionists helped. He had known of men walking about for six weeks trying to find work when work was close at hand and would have been found if labour bureaux had been in existence. He hoped the President of the Local Government Board would insist on their establishment all over the country with a centre in London, so that at any given time one might ascertain from the central labour department how many unemployed there were in England and what steps were required to be taken in order to assist them. It would also greatly assist the right hon. Gentleman in the distribution of the money he was prepared to spend. The only criterion of the needs of a district was the number of unemployed, and how could that information be obtained unless we had properly-managed labour bureaux? Let them extend their sympathies a little more widely and broadly to all sections of the unemployed irrespective of their present condition. He wondered how many hon. Members had seen men become unemployable. He had seen a first rate man come up from the country with his wife, who had been a dairymaid. The man had always been in regular employment on the land until then. He came to Canning Town in the hope of getting work, and got casual employment in the docks. He followed the course of that man for some eighteen months; he was doing casual work all the time, not earning more than 15s. or 16s. a week, out of which he paid 5s. or 6s. a week for rooms. He lost sight of him for a time, but two years afterwards he found him in the London docks. He was a man of sterling character and a teetotaller, with a charming wife, but in their new surroundings both the man and his wife had become drunkards. Their two children had died and they were living in one room absolutely demoralised and degraded. He had seen the same process going on in hundreds of cases. Consequently he asked the Committee to temper its judgment with mercy and extend a helping hand to those men who were down in the mire. He was sure the President of the Local Government Board would help any man if he could. As for labour colonies, if they were not fit for anything else—and many of them were not suitable places for the good men amongst the unemployed—they were fit to be a sort of haven of refuge and mercy for the men who were so low down that there was no other hope for them in the world. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would do his best to help some of these inferior men, because whilst they were in London they were only ruining the rest of the population and making it harder for the good men to get work. He would suggest that labour colonies should be used for these men who were what had been called unemployable, instead of allowing them to remain in the streets going from bad to worse. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his words of sympathy, but it should not be forgotten that after all, the chief causes of the unemployed difficulty, as he said at the outset, were the unequal distribution of wealth and the unequal distribution of population.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he only rose to express his respectful agreement with the right hon. Gentleman in what he had said with regard to farm colonies. He had had some experience on the subject and he knew what had been done at Hadleigh.

His knowledge upon that subject, like that of Mr. Weller, was "extensive and peculiar." He knew the courage and determination which had been displayed by the Salvation Army at Hadleigh, but he did not think the colony there had been a success. If they wanted to make farm colonies a success they would have to get the men on them earlier. It was no good taking men at the age of forty or fifty and telling them to dig. Some of these men did not know barley from oats, a cock from a hen, or mangel wurzels from turnips, and yet they expected them to succeed on farm colonies. The hon. Member for Leicester was quite right when he said that all these men had to do was to dig a hole one day and fill it up the next. It was a good gallery business for some people, but it would not do, because they were begining at the wrong end. These men had not the physical energy to work, and knew nothing about farming. His own idea was that the bulk of these farm colonies were generally started by some land agent who wanted to get rid of bad land and a job, and he got some philanthropist who wanted a title to run it. If they put young men on the land they might make something of them, but old men would be no good on the farm; they might just as well throw their money into the sea.

*MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead) expressed his approval of the sympathy shown by the President of the Local Government Board and the earnest way in which he was attempting to tackle this problem. It was sometimes assumed that unless they were prepared to agree with an attempted solution that they knew to be wrong they had no sympathy. In his opinion it was better to attempt no solution at all than the wrong one. That might be considered an unkind, perhaps an unsympathetic attitude, but he firmly believed in it. If they were to solve this problem on wrong lines and thereby create more problems than they were settling it would be far better to stand still. He hoped the President of the Local Government Board would be able to give an assurance that the scheme could be worked out on lines that would ensure success in the administration of the fund. His own view was that it was impossible to blend the solution of this problem with the ordinary local life of the community. It required to be taken in hand in a more methodical way than it was likely to be by a scratch committee of amateurs, brought together partly as a result of local favouritism. In the creation of the machinery indicated in the observations of the President of the Local Government Board some strong central body would need to be set up to ensure that in the expenditure of the money they got the maximum of efficiency with the minimum of waste and corruption. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would secure as far as possible that the attempts at the solution of this problem would in no way interfere with or discourage the increase of trade union influences and the bringing of men together in self-governing bodies, such as friendly societies, where they would be able to solve these problems better for themselves. In his opinion, there would be no solution of this problem until they had abolished the penniless man, who, the moment his earning power ceased, was face to face with want, and must spread the circle of want because of his lack of purchasing power. He believed it was possible for this Government, if it would tackle other problems in a radical way, to set at work influences that would do far more to solve the unemployed problem permanently than any amount of tinkering in the way some of their friends had suggested. For instance, they were not solving the unemployed problem if over a wide area they spent a large sum of money and got only a fraction of its value back in results While doing what they could in a charitable direction, they must not fail to set at work influences that within themselves had the creative force that would make for a lessening of the supply of the cases that became unemployed and unemployable. People would be able to think more clearly on the subject if they had more scientific information as to theorigin of the unemployed and unemployable. He would like to know, for example, what proportion of these unemployed men had returned from the war. How many of them were Reserve men, who, as the result of the war, had their normal life broken up and who on their return where unable to settle down in the old way? He was not saying that these men should not have gone to the war; he merely said that satisfactory and reliable information on the point would enable them to come to a better conclusion with regard to the problem. He hoped they would not as the result of all these experiments, helpful as they might be even in dealing here and there with people who had become unemployable, have their attention taken away from those other great reforms which the President of the Local Government Board had foreshadowed: he referred to the attempt to deal with the agricultural districts in order to make agriculture more scientific, and to introduce co-operation among those interested—labourers, small holders and others. That of itself would set up influences which would keep men from coming into the big cities. By being retained on the land these people, instead of being a drain on the resources of the country would, as a matter of fact, contribute to the national wealth and character. He would beg those who were tackling this problem not to forget the question of the land. He hoped that when the promised measures were brought forward it would be found that the Government had a bold land policy which would enable men in the rural districts to get land cheap. He would rather see increased facilities for loans given to the Public Works Loans Commissioners or some other public body, and the national credit placed at the disposal of those agencies which were working out a solution of the problem in a more effective way than was possible on a basis of charity. They should not discourage those forces that made for self-help and thrift, for so long as there were hundreds of thousands always on the verge of poverty without a penny of reserve there would be no permanent solution of the unemployed problem.

*Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) thought they had been discussing the question of the unemployed from the wrong end. What they wanted was to try and so shape the policy of the country as to prevent men from becoming unemployed. He was delighted with the proposals of the President of the Local Government Board, particularly with the proposal to put into operation in this country provisions similar to those employed in dealing with Irish rural housing. If they could only deal with the question here on the same scale and in the same proportion to population they need not discuss the Unemployed Act at all, because there would be no unemployed to deal with. There would be work for all, and the grant of £200,000 would not be necessary. If the President of the Local Government Board proceeded, and introduced a Bill to enable local authorities to acquire land for the purpose of dealing with rural and urban housing along the lines which had taken practical shape as far as Ireland was concerned, it would involve a proposal to spend nearly £20,000,000, and he believed the spending of that money on useful works of that description would be far more beneficial, and the results far more satisfactory, than would accrue from the spending of £200,000 upon relief works. It had been suggested that the whole of the trouble was due to the fact that there was an unequal distribution of wealth in the country. There again he thought there was a slight error. Many men who had studied the matter had come to the conclusion that so long as private ownership of land, and private ownership of the means of producing wealth, and consequently the means of employing labour, was in the hands of comparatively few people there would be suffering from periodical depression and want of employment. The existence of the unemployed seemed part and parcel of our constitution and present methods of production. It was along these lines they ought to deal with the problem. He believed that if the House had the courage to deal with the question of hours of labour on something like a general basis, with something like scientific knowledge as to the differences of trade and differences of locality, it would solve the problem for many years to come. The advance in labour-saving machinery and the development of new industries might require an amendment in future years, but it was quite clear that it was an anomaly to have men walking the streets vainly looking for work while a large proportion of other men were working excessively long hours. These two things were a contradiction, and surely the wisdom of Parliament ought to be sufficient to solve the problem. He did not for a moment suppose that the House of Commons was going to deal with the subject in a heroic manner. Since he had attended Parliament he had come to the conclusion that probably everything under the sun would be tried to solve the problem except the right thing. The right thing would be the last one thought of. Every Member would agree that an enormous number of men were working excessively long hours, thereby keeping other men out of employment, and consequently the shortening of the hours of labour would solve the problem to a great extent. Supposing it was possible for the President of the Board of Trade to introduce a Bill making it compulsory for railway companies to adopt an eight hours system for their servants in future, or supposing that the whole of the mining industry was worked on an eight hours day, and that Government employees and municipal employees were treated in the same way. He thought it was along these lines that they should go if they possibly could in order to prevent chronic unemployment from appearing. These were the only safe lines on which they could proceed in attempting to deal with the problem. With regard to farm colonies he shared the suspicion of the President of the Local Government Board. Suppose there were collected together a number of watchmakers, engineers, compositors and men belonging to other trades, and they were dumped down in a particular locality and provided with spades. That was not going to solve the problem in the slightest degree. Possibly it could be done by an alteration in the land system, not with the view of creating a number of proprietors, but by allowing the municipalities to have the power of compulsorily acquiring land and letting it out on reasonable and fair terms, and even assisting those who were willing to undertake the tilling of a block of land by giving them tools and seeds, and generally helping them in a hundred other ways. When he said that they were discussing this subject from the wrong end, he spoke as one who had been unemployed himself. Of all the sights in the world one of the most pathetic was that of an honest workman looking for employment. He had walked the streets of London for six or eight weeks sometimes, and once in 1886 he walked the streets for sixteen weeks looking for work, getting scarcely anything to eat all day. Then towards evening when the works were closing he had to walk home through the mud and sludge to the place where he was living. Probably that was the most doleful sight and the most heartbreaking experience that could possibly be imagined. That sort of thing went on from day to day without any prospect of being able to provide for those dependent on the man who was looking for employment. It was only necessary to be in that position to know how serious this problem was, and how essential it was to find a solution.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he had listened with great pleasure to the speeches of the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent and the hon. Member for Birkenhead. Until they spoke the Committee had concentrated too much attention on the question of dealing with the unemployed when they existed, and too little to preventing their existence. Almost everybody had expressed approval of the speech of the President of the Local Government Board, and, though he shared the approval of that speech, he was not quite sure whether the approval had been given so much to his proposals as to his speech. Personally he approved of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, but not of his proposal that a grant of £200,000 should be given in aid of the unemployed fund. He thought that that grant would intensify the evil rather than remove it. If £200,000 was going to be given for the relief of the unemployed, there would soon be found more unemployed than ever. It was like the story of the old lady who was told by her gardener that the sparrows were eating up the fruit buds of the trees in the orchard, and who put out bread crumbs to entice them away from the buds. She cut up a half-a-quartern loaf every day, but found that she only attracted additional sparrows to her garden. In like manner, he insisted that if they were going to give £200,000 to the unemployed under the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman, there would probably be more unemployed than ever. He was confident that the right hon. Gentleman would do his best to use this money so as not to accentuate the evil but to try to prevent it. He did not believe that by spending the taxpayers' money they could reduce the number of the unemployed, because every man relieved was counterbalanced by another man who had been thrown out of work. Another thing he wished to point out was the wastefulness of all forms of relief work. The hon. Member below him had admitted how difficult it was to find suitable work for men out of employment—and in practice nearly all the work invented for the unemployed was useless work. The hon. Member for Leicester agreed that digging a hole and filling it up again was the beginning of a training in agriculture. He himself had worked for several months as an agricultural labourer, but never once had he been asked to dig holes in the ground in order to fill them up again. He agreed with the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent that what they had to do was to see whether they could not prevent the evil of unemployment. Not only would a grant do nothing to diminish the number of the unemployed; it would do something to increase it, for it would tend to weaken the trade union movement, one great feature of which was the giving of assistance to members out of work. After all, the whole problem was a matter of wages. The ideal they had to set before themselves was the raising of the wages of the whole community, so that every man would be able himself to provide for his unemployed time.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) said he was very glad that they had had such a sympathetic speech from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board. He had never been uncharitably disposed towards Cabinet Ministers of whatever rank, but he confessed that they had not often had such sympathetic references from a Cabinet Minister as had fallen that afternoon from the right hon. Gentleman. He quite agreed with the President of the Local Government Board that this problem was not going to be solved by one Minister or by one Government. He quite anticipated it would be many generations before a solution was arrived at. Until something was done towards adjusting the nation's labour to the nation's needs there would always be the anomaly of some men working too long, while others were unable to find a purchaser for their labour at all. He had heard with astonishment that the hours of railway servants could not possibly be reduced because the branch lines could not pay any dividends. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that, after all, farm colonies and other expedients which had been resorted to were merely palliatives; and he regretted that the President of the Local Government Board had not placed anything tangible before the Committee. What they had to do was to get the people back to the land and give them an opportunity of developing their latent powers and the national resources. But they ought to go further back than that and begin in the schools of the country. He was very pleased at the speech of the President of the Local Government Board not because of its actual terms, but because it indicated the right line along which they should travel towards reconstructing society in such a way that they could say there was a place in it for everybody. They were sometimes inclined to be censorious about the unemployed workmen, and they had been told that very few members of trade unions or benefit societies had made applications for relief. But he himself had seen men of capacity and sobriety who had been displaced from employment by the encroachment of machinery. They had for a time lived on their savings, but these could not last for ever; and a limit had even to be placed on trade union benefits. In his own trade they paid five weeks benefits for unemployment, but for eight weeks in the quarter the men had to rely on their own resources. In the five largest trade unions last year they paid out £600,000 for unemployed benefits. It seemed strange to him that they should be discussing the question of the unemployed during the summer, because he could remember the day when this question was regarded as a seasonal one which only arose during the winter months. They were, it appeared, however, now cognisant of the fact that the unemployed problem was always with us. We now knew that there were always unemployed and recognised that in consequence there was something wrong with our social system, and that without a large re-organisation of society there could be no solution of this problem. He wished to know whether the President of the Local Government Board had in contemplation any legislation for restricting the hours of labour upon our railways and in other industrial concerns. If such a policy was pursued, it would lead to a wider diffusion of labour among the working classes, and would be a corollary to the distribution of the wealth of the nation which seemed to be desirable. The mere grant of £200,000 was not the attractive part of the proposal of the President of the Local Government Board, because small measures could have no effect at all. Something bold and heroic was needed, and he thought that the President of the Local Government Board saw that more comprehensive steps were necessary. It was true that they could not solve this problem in a day or in a week, or even in a year; still they could lay the foundation for a state of things in which a man who was willing to work would be able to obtain employment.

*MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said he had had some little experience in regard to this question in a constituency which was not merely industrial, but where the evil they had to deal with, although not so great as in large towns, was still of an aggravated character and a matter of considerable difficulty. In his constituency they had made inquiries and in the course of two months they found there were at least 1,000 men who were not seeking for charitable help, but were looking for work and to whom work was necessary in order to maintain themselves and their wives and families. A good deal had been said about the migration from the villages to the towns, but what was the cause of that? The cause of the migration of the agricultural labourer to the towns was the fact that at the present moment the farmer had no security of tenure. Indeed, he had no security of any kind, if he invested his capital in the land, that he or those dependent upon him would reap the benefit of his labour and capital. The result was that there was a large amount of land lying idle and a large amount of capital unemployed. Because the tenant was in this position, the labourer was not employed. To that must be added the question of housing, and he trusted the provisions of the Labourers Bill would be applied to England and Wales. The saddest problem with which they had to deal was the case of men who were neither loafers not idlers, but who could not find work through inefficiency arising from physical weakness or advancing years. A man who found himself out of work at fifty years of age was in a hopeless position, and his difficulties were bound to increase in consequence of competition, and because of the burdens put upon the employers. The result of this burden was that an employer was bound to secure and retain in his service only the most efficient men for the production of wealth. That was a problem which they must face. If through the force of competition and the burdens put upon him the employer was put to greater expense, the workman could not look to him for charity. It was, however, the basis of civilisation and of every human society that the State should protect human life, and he held that the State should also see that a man had an opportunity of maintaining that life in a reasonable state of comfort. The President of the Local Government Board was going to hand over £200,000 and he was very pleased that the Government were going to take that step. There was, however, the danger that it might paralyse voluntary effort, as had been the case in his own county, when public funds had been used even for permanent work. It was, however, essential that the claims of these men should be considered in a sympathetic spirit, and he urged the Government to hand money to the county councils to spend on the main roads, which were matters of national concern.

*MR. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said that it was the first time he had had the opportunity of addressing the House, and he did not intend to err on the side of length. He had only one suggestion to put forward to the President of the Local Government Board. He wished that the right hon. Gentleman could see his way, by putting judicious pressure upon boards of guardians of the country, to withdraw the children who were now living in the workhouses and put them instead into "scattered homes." If that were done it would result in the rearing of children to become honest hardworking men and women instead of letting them become, as many thousands did, habitual paupers. There were 60,000 pauper children, and only 8,500 were living in "scattered homes." The result of the scattered home system had been immensely to benefit the children, and through them the nation. In the district which he represented on the London County Council there were scores of people who had been in the workhouses for the past twenty years and who were brought up as children in workhouses, returning to them again as paupers. He had visited one of these scattered homes in order to satisfy himself of the efficacy of the system. He found that for the cost of the child in the workhouse, viz., 20s. a week, it could be looked after in one of these homes by a foster mother at 8s. 6d. a week; it would be removed from the workhouse taint; and when these children arrived at the age of fourteen or fifteen, situations could be found for them without the employers knowing that they had been pauper children. The children in these scattered homes had brightness and happiness that was absent from their unfortunate companions in the workhouse. He urged the President of the Local Government Board earnestly to take the matter into his consideration and make it imperative upon guardians to adopt these scattered homes for the children instead of putting them into the workhouse.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) urged the President to get his Department to hasten on some of those schemes which many local authorities were anxious to carry into effect to provide work for thousands of unfortunate people during the coming winter.

*MR JOHN BURNS, replying to the various points which had been raised, said he was pleased that the question of the dock labourers had been referred to, but was afraid the hon. Member for Tottenham had attributed to him greater influence than he could hope to command in regard to the dock labour question in the East End of London. His old antagonists, the dock directors, to their credit, had done a great deal to mitigate the evils of casual employment during the last few years. Greater regularity of employment had been secured for many classes of dock labourers to such an extent that now many of the present difficulties in the East End were the inevitable consequences of converting casual labour into more regular employment. A smaller number of men were now given regular work, and that left a greater responsibility for those who could not get even casual work. There were three or four districts in this country, and the East-End was one, where no other remedy was possible but migration or emigration. When they had 2,000 men in one parish for whom there was never any probability of work, it was time to adopt exceptional and perhaps unpopular remedies. He did not trouble about unpopularity, if the right thing were done. If by migration the evils of West Ham could be mitigated, then West Ham had got to move on, and if the evils of Poplar could only be cured by emigration he was prepared to be unpopular and start emigration schemes for Poplar. As to municipalities being appealed to, he knew one municipality which had adopted the very sensible course of not giving employment to any man under forty years of age for work that did not require much physical energy, such as caretakers and watchmen. Younger and more vigorous men should be too proud to take jobs more fitted for old men. The hon. Member for Tottenham had said that a new industry must be invented. The Government were considering, and he believed the result would be effective and speedy action, whether the Board of Agriculture co-operating with the department in charge of woods and forests, could not set apart from 8,000 to 10,000 acres of land for some economic and self-supporting development of afforestation and thereby create a new trade. The Member for North West Ham wanted an idea of how the money would be granted. In the distribution of this money it would be better to err on the side of being too hard, because it would permanently damage any scheme if through mistaken sympathy they allowed their hearts to run away with their heads in spending the ratepayers' money. He had refused to allow one town of 150,000 inhabitants, where they had only six men out of work, to set up a distress committee. In a town of that size he would not allow a distress committee if they had sixty men out of work. This £200,000 would be distributed according to the necessity, the poverty, and the unemployment of the district. Might he respectfully say to one who sympathised with West Ham perhaps more than any other district in England or Wales that some of West Ham's troubles might be due to the fact that it was willing to receive money for any purpose from any quarter, and was not altogether so wise or cautious in its expenditure as it might be? He was not so sure that the newspaper funds that were started the winter before last and to some extent last year did not do more harm than good to the districts temporarily cursed by mistaken and unorganised charity. With reference to the farm colony, he would be sympathetic towards it. He paid it one visit and he hoped during the vacation to pay two or three more visits, and if it was not doing the work he liked he would do his best as the arbiter of this money to see that even West Ham was kept decently and in order. The hon. Member for North West Ham, being an enthusiast, attributed a little too much to labour colonies, even the good ones, as training schools for emigrants. When he was in Canada, before the election, agricultural experts there told him that very frequently the man who made the best show in agriculture and farming in Canada was the man who knew the least about agricultural methods in this country, because he was more adaptable. Even the best of these farm colonies, that at Hollesley Bay, had only emigrated in eighteen months thirty-two men out of 800 who had gone there. But he was not grumbling at that, and he wished the farm colonies success. The late President of the Local Government Board did not think he was generous enough in a quotation he had made. He stumbled into that quotation, and he did not think it ought to have been made. He was sorry he made it, and if it displeased the right hon. Gentleman he withdrew it. He did not intend to be ungenerous, but he had a right to express his disapproval of an Act which many people had adversely criticised, and which, notwithstanding everything that had been said this afternoon, still had many defects, one of which had to be rectified by a proposal this afternoon. The hon. Member for Leicester, to whom he was particularly grateful for his sympathetic speech, quoted certain towns in which the proportion of skilled artisans was larger than that which he had given, but they were both approximately right, because the cases quoted by his hon. friend were a small number of the total he had taken. His hon. friend then put in a plea for the women. He did not say that the number of women who had registered themselves showed the volume of female unemployed. Women suffered in patience, and for that reason they ought to be more sympathetic to them. He had given a practical example of that. His hon. friend said that he was pleased to notice that he (Mr. Burns) was more sympathetic to farm colonies than hitherto. A minister had no right to incorporate in his ministerial work either his private opinions or personal prejudices which he might have had on any subject before becoming a minister. It was the business of ministers to be the servants of the House of Commons, and the slaves of the public, and they had no right to push unduly their personal opinions, and while holding his pristine views as a private individual, he was prepared as a minister to take at least during the experimental period a sympathetic view towards the economic vagaries which in farm colonies sometimes found their most eccentric expression. The hon. Member for Birkenhead said that much of the unemployed problem was largely due to the fact that there were so many penniless men. In his judgment, higher wages more wisely spent was one of the best solutions of the unemployed problem. We had penniless men because we had too many thirsty men. There were many men who could not make both ends meet merely because they were always trying to make one end drink. It seemed to him that a nation which spent £160,000,000 on drink, £50,000,000 on sport, and another £50,000,000 as the direct and indirect consequences of both, a total equal to the value of our export trade, ought to be able to give sufficient wages to men to enable them to tide over bad times. In the Census returns there were two classes of unemployed. One class, varying from 150,000 to 300,000, were the casuals and the unemployed workmen who took part in processions. The other class of unemployed, who did not organise or ask for aid from the rates and taxes, numbered about 320,000 between the ages of twenty and sixty-five. According to the Census they had so little work that they did not record the fact that they got their living by any form of work. He believed that means would have to be devised by which, either through rates better spent or the income-tax more judiciously invested, relief might be given to the unemployed poor who were seen in our streets. He thanked the Committee for the reception they had given to this aspect of the work of his Department. On behalf of his officials who had helped in this matter in and out of season, day and night, he was particularly grateful for the way his remarks had been received this afternoon. He assured the Committee he would spare no effort to grapple with the temporary problem, and he hoped that his Department would be able to make concrete proposals for the removal of the causes which were responsible for our having in our midst men who were willing to work but were unable to obtain employment. The unemployed problem had been advanced a long distance by that discussion, and he thanked all sections of the Committee for the kindly and sympathetic way in which they had assisted his Department in their attempt to solve it.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) desired to ask the help of the President of the Local Government Board in a matter of administration very closely connected with the question before the Committee. He referred to the boarding-out of children. A new order was issued in 1905 for children boarded-out without the union. He would ask whether a similar revision of the order for children boarded-out within the union could be given. They wanted a new order in regard to three points in particular where they found themselves hampered in getting children out of the workhouse. No child above three years of age ought ever to see the inside of a workhouse. They required larger powers over the children of vagrant parents who come in and out of their workhouses. Boarding-out was the most hopeful way of dealing with such children. They wanted the right hon. Gentleman to raise the amount which could be paid for boarding-out children within the union to that permitted for boarding out without the union. At present they were only allowed to pay 4s. in the former case as against 5s. in the latter Lastly, he wanted the right hon. Gentleman to make boarding-out committees compulsory within as well as without the union. Then there would be an extension of the boarding-out system to the great benefit of the coming generation.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said they had heard a great deal about the East End of London, but up to this moment no opportunity had been given to the voice of East London to be heard. As he had had the honour of sitting in this House for sixteen years as a representative of that part of London, he thought he had some right to speak on the subject.

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and leave having been given to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 10, further proceeding stood postponed without Question put.

THE PROPOSED ARMY REDUCTIONS.

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said he felt sure that the House in all its sections would do him the justice of believing that he did not rise to move the adjournment of the House with any intention of putting himself forward as an expert upon military subjects. He had no claim whatever to be considered an expert, and he had very little hope that anything which he might be able to say in regard to the Army was likely to instruct the House or any section of it. He founded his claim to make an appeal to the Government largely upon the fact that there were many Members of the House who, like himself, had no right to claim special knowledge, and who were dependent for their information upon the exposition of policy given by the Government to enable them to form those views upon military subjects which every Member ought to possess, no matter whether he was a military expert or not. It must be perfectly clear that when hon. Members went to their constituencies and were asked to offer some opinion upon proposals of such a far-reaching character as those which had been introduced by the Government at a very late period of the session, they were quite unable to do so unless they were in possession of that explanation and assistance from the Government in regard to their proposals which they were reasonably entitled to demand. What was felt so strongly on the Opposition side of the House was that proposals which, whatever else might be said of them, were extremely serious and were likely for many years to be irrevocable should be placed before them with such inadequate provision for their due discussion. Last year, when his right hon. friend the Member for Croydon introduced his scheme, nineteen days remained for the discussions in Committee of Supply, and the Opposition used those opportunities to the full, and some very useful criticisms were made throughout those debates, with the result that the minds of all hon. Members of this House and of persons interested in the country received considerable enlightenment, and the proposals themselves underwent, as the House would recollect, great modification. There was another precedent, for when Mr. Brodrick introduced his highly controversial proposals in the shape of Resolutions they were placed upon the Table of the House in the month of May so that any hon. Member could acquaint himself with them, and the most ample opportunities were given for debate. He did not think that anyone would contend that either of those precedents supplied the slightest justification to the Government for the extraordinarily short time which they had allotted to the discussion of the present far-reaching proposals. The House had had up to the present six days in Supply on Army Estimates, but those Estimates were discussed upon the explicit assurances of the Secretary of State for War that the reductions in the Army which he had since proposed were not going to be made at once. There had been one day's discussion and one only in this House of those serious and irreparable proposals, the irrevocability of which was the justification of this Motion. Six hours was the precise period which the House had enjoyed to discuss military problems of such complexity and moment. The actual proposals of the Secretary of State were discussed during a period of six hours, of which the right hon. Gentleman's own speech, an intellectual treat for all those who heard it, occupied three hours. A calculation he had made showed that, of the remaining three hours, considerably over an hour was consumed by hon. Gentlemen on the Government side of the House, so that the whole time given for the expression of the views of the Opposition amounted to between an hour and a half and two hours. There might have been some justification for such a proceeding if the right hon. Gentleman had in any way warned them during the discussion of the Estimates that proposals of the kind he had made were in contemplation. But the right hon. Gentleman had entitled them to expect the exact opposite. On May 30th he said—

> "I do not propose to do anything without the matter coming properly before the House."†

while on June 7th he was even more explicit. The right hon. Gentleman then said—

> "It was the policy of the Government to take the Committee very much into their confidence in the matter. He would make a general statement in July, when ample opportunity would be given for the fullest discussion."‡

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cvliii., 399.
‡ See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 532.

He ventured to say, in reminding the right hon. Gentleman of those assurances, that they were entitled to ask that those pledges should be carried out, not only in the letter, but in the spirit. He thought his Motion was one which he might reasonably ask the House to adopt, because changes were apparently to be made forthwith in regard to the Army which had not yet received the sanction of Parliament, and they were of such vital importance that he thought he had a right to claim that the fullest opportunities for discussion should be given. Nobody would suggest that if it was proposed to disband only 200 men there would be any necessity to raise the question in this way, but in deciding whether this was a definite question of urgent public importance, it was the essence of the discussion to consider what was involved in the proposals which had been so summarily and briefly laid before the House of Commons. As far as he had been able to understand the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman he gathered that ten fully efficient battalions disappeared and that a fourth of Section D of the Reserve went. They lost, as he understood it, 15,380 men by the closing of Section D in addition to the loss of 20,000 men the right hon. Gentleman had warned them of. If they added the turnover to the Reserve, which, of course, would be forfeited in respect of the battalions that disappeared, they arrived at a total of 40,000 men who were to be taken from the Army at the present time. And this at the very time when Lord Roberts, whose authority to define what the dimensions of the Regular Army should be no one would question, had declared, in another place, that—

> "The Regular Army is only just numerically strong enough to admit of its policing the Empire in times of peace."†

There was nobody in this House who would question the high authority of Lord Roberts to define what the dimensions of the Regular Army ought to be. If the country had been told either at the last election or a year or two previously that at the very moment when a great soldier was declaring in another place that the Army was only just numerically strong enough to police the Empire in times of peace, the Government would have come to the House of Commons with proposals for reductions of this character without any warning to the country it would have caused the greatest possible surprise and consternation. Many hon. Members on the Opposition side would remember the weapon which was used against them in their own constituencies on this very point by hon. Members opposite. They were told on the placards at the election that Lord Roberts had said that the Army was no more efficient and no more prepared for war than it was before the war broke out in South Africa. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] Many hon. Members opposite appeared to be still proud of the use they made of that observation. When the Secretary of State for War introduced his Army Estimate he declared that the Army was never more efficient than it was to-day. He might inform hon. Members who were so proud of the misleading publicity, they had given to the statement of Lord Roberts that his Lordship had long since disavowed it, and he would remind them of what the Minister for War had said—a tribute which furnished a very complete reply to the ignorant and unscrupulous strictures passed in so many quarters on his right hon. friend the Member for Croydon. With the greatest possible respect for the right hon. Gentleman, if it were a question of the equitable doctrine of conversion they would look upon him as one of the greatest authorities in the country, and equally so if it were a question of the existence of matter or the esoteric doctrine of pure Hegelism; but upon a purely military matter and problems involving the defence of the Empire he confessed that he greatly preferred the opinion of the great military authority whom he had quoted. It was essential to ask, in considering the importance of these proposals, what it was the right hon. Gentleman was going to put in the place of that which he was attempting to destroy. He had told the Committee that he was going to secure an expeditionary force consisting of 50,000 Regulars, 70,000 Reservists, and 30,000 Militia. There was no obligation on the existing Militia to serve abroad; and, therefore, unless they responded to a purely patriotic call, 30,000 of the expeditionary force would disappear altogether. But, assuming that the whole of that force was forthcoming at the time it was wanted, what Regular troops were left behind in this country to make good the wastage of war? Seven battalions of infantry, two cavalry regiments, and four batteries of Horse Artillery—a total of 56,000 men, and of these 25,000 were surplus Reservists and young soldiers. The effect of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals was to make the forces of the country weaker with no security for expansion. The Report of the Elgin Commission stated that no military system would be satisfactory which did not contain powers of expansion outside the limits of the Regular forces of the Crown; and the Norfolk Commission reported that in its existing condition the Militia was unfit to take the field for the defence of the country. It might well be that the right hon. Gentleman would discover some means of improving the Militia, but why, in the name of common sense, until some practical step had been taken to make the Militia effective, was the House irrevocably to commit itself to the proposal that 40,000 men should be disbanded? When the Army Vote was first introduced the right hon Gentleman said—

---

† (See (4) *Debates* clx, 666 7.

> "I do not think you will ever satisfactorily reduce your striking force unless you provide some power of expansion behind it in this country."†

Did the right hon. Gentleman still hold that view? Doubt and disquiet were felt by a very large number of persons on this question, and he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman what prospect he had of being able to secure this expansion in proximate time, and what in detail were the steps by which he would do it. With regard to the personal explanation made by the Secretary for War, he could not help thinking the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood the complaint made. Might he remind the right hon. Gentleman that on March 6th the hon. Member for Shrewsbury asked him—

> "Whether the effect of the disbanding of ten battalions of the Regular Army will be that the cadres will cease to exist when the operation is completed"? ‡

He called attention to the fact that in that question there was nothing to enable the right hon. Gentleman to draw a distinction between the home and foreign battalions. The Secretary for War replied—

> "There is no foundation whatever for the report that ten battalions of the Regular Army are to be disbanded commencing on April 1st next year, or any other date."†

MR. HALDANE said this referred to rumours with regard to the Aldershot battalions. He had said it would be insane to reduce ten Aldershot battalions. He also explained that the reductions must take place in the colonial battalions, and the whole night was spent in discussing that question.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said that was on March 8th.

MR. HALDANE: The 6th, 7th, and 8th.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said the answer to the question of the hon. Member for Shrewsbury was given on the 6th, and in that statement there was no reservation whatever, and no mention whatever of the Aldershot battalions. It was subsequently that the right hon. Gentleman made the statement as to a mare's nest. They found, however, that the Government had taken over the mare's nest—a very appropriate incubator for the Army of the future. Had the right hon. Gentleman and his advisers considered the needs of the Empire, entirely divorced from any political pressure? He fully accepted the right hon. Gentleman's intimation to that effect as far as he was concerned. But there was one sinister feature within their recollection, and that was, that in his first speech he frequently used the words "efficiency" and "economy." The word "efficiency" was loudly cheered by the Opposition, but the word "economy" was even more loudly cheered by the Ministerialists. They also recollected that the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division moved a reduction, which he declined to withdraw, even at the personal request of the Prime Minister; and it was common knowledge that pressure of that kind had been exercised both inside the House and outside. If the right hon. Gentleman told them that these political representations had not interfered with the free exercise of his judgment, it would reassure them very greatly, and they would merely be left face to face with one of the most interesting coincidences of modern times. Alarmist statements had been made in the country as to the amount spent on the Army. It was true that in 1861 we spent £15,000,000, and that in 1906 we spent £30,000,000. The purpose served by this expenditure was to insure the capitalised wealth of he country, which was moderately calculated at £15,000,000,000, and he thought any business man would agree that the amount of the premium was not excessive. And when they considered that in the last ten years our military liabilities had increased tenfold, he did not think the doubling of the amount spent on the Army in forty-four years was an excessive proportion. The increase was insignificant when compared with the astonishing development of property assessed to income-tax which in eighteen years showed an increase of £474,000,000. There was a very real anxiety lest the right hon. Gentleman was flinging away the substance for the shadow—even before they got the shadow. Only four or five years ago this country employed 250,000 men in South Africa at the same time. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman how far his expeditionary scheme would have been adequate to cope with the difficulties which confronted the country during the late war, and how far had the military advisers considered the adequacy of his proposals to provide for a similar crisis in the future. It was only nine or ten years since a very economical Chancellor of the Exchequer Sir M. Hicks-Beach, consented to the addition of 25,000 men to the Army, and but for that large addition there would not have been a single battalion of Foot, or battery of Artillery, in this country at the time of the South African War. The real secret of the greatness of the country was not always to be thinking of the cost necessary to safeguard its material interests, but of the incalculable value of the interests on behalf of which they were incurring the expenditure. In the words of Lord Roberts—

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 675.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 282.

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 282.

> "An Empire which cannot defend its own possessions must inevitably perish."

He begged to move.

Mr. F. E. Smith.

*LORD CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone), in seconding the Motion, said he associated himself with his hon. friend the Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool in regard to the most important and complex quesion now before the House. There were many present to-night who had not had an opportunity of taking part in the debate on this question and who sincerely hoped to hear something really more definite from the Secretary of State for War than they had heard up to the present moment. His hon. friend had stated very clearly why hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House were anxious that the adjournment of the House should be moved in order that this most important question might be discussed. He was glad to think that the opinion prevailed on both sides of the House that the discussion of this question had not in any sense been adequate. He sincerely hoped that the Secretary of State for War would begin to realise that perhaps he had been carried away by the large majority behind him, and that it might be that they thought that hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House had no right to question the opinions they expressed. To his mind the Government had adopted a most unconstitutional line. In a word, it had been proposed to decimate the Army by methods which the Opposition were to have no opportunity of discussing. An hon. friend had asked the Prime Minister if it were possible to disband the whole Army without any discussion in this House, and from the ambiguous answer given at the moment he thought the right hon. Gentleman had in his mind that it was possible to do so. He welcomed this discussion for several reasons without in any sense wishing to impugn the motives of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He should like very much to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether the scheme put forward had received the unanimous approval of the Army Council—the body of experts of which the Secretary of State was the mouthpiece. He felt that the effect of this discussion all over the country would be good, because he had reason to believe that it was the opinion of the country that the Government were desirous of stifling discussion on this question. Everyone recognised the manner in which the Education Bill had been forced through the House. As to the Army scheme they were all well aware that such a new scheme was inevitable; but the scheme propounded by the right hon. Gentleman the other day had not even the merit of being original. There had always been a tendency in this country to reduce the Army after a war, and to continue the reduction until another war had to be faced, when it was found that we were in an unprepared condition. As a matter of fact the Liberal Government was driven out of office in 1895 because of the lack of ammunition which they had provided for the Army. There were two possible schemes: one to maintain a small Army, and trust to the patriotism of the nation to furnish the men in case of emergency, a scheme for which, to use an expression of the President of the Board of Agriculture, we would have to pay through the nose. The other scheme was that we should have an Army in time of peace capable of expansion on the outbreak of war. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War had said that he wished to have at command an expeditionary army of 154,000 men. Was that to be the Government's cut-and-dried scheme? What really we required was a force capable of expansion to meet all emergencies. He saw no sign that foreign countries were anxious to enter into international arbitration. It must be remembered that at the beginning of the last century this country had a bigger Army than at the present day, population being considered, and if we were to maintain the spirit of our ancestors, and our position amongst the nations of the world, the Army must be maintained in proper proportion. The argument was sometimes used that we should rely for our defence not so much on the Army as on the Navy; but he would ask at what period of our history had the Navy alone been able to carry on a successful war. It was said that this Government had come into power with a mandate to cut down all expenditure, and especially the expenditure on the Army. The right hon. Gentleman the Minister for War proposed to reduce the Army by 20,000 men, and that his expeditionary force should be composed of a large number of Militia. He did not very strongly object himself to the reduction of the *personnel* of the Army. But he thought the right hon. Gentleman was making a very great mistake in reducing the number of cadres or units, for it was the system of the unit which made the Army capable of expansion in time of war. This was not a Party question, and he and the Opposition generally did not wish to approach the question of the Army from any Party point of view. That had been shown by the hearty reception given by the Opposition to the first excellent speech made by the right hon. Gentleman which had led them to form a higher opinion of his capacity as a War Minister than was warranted by his later utterances. He was entirely opposed to the detestable system of conscription, and that was another reason why he viewed with distrust this new scheme of Army reorganisation. He urged the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider the attitude he had taken up in regard to this question, and he hoped that the Prime Minister would see his way to give another day for the discussion of this important subject.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said that if it had not been for the Army schemes of the right hon. Mr. Brodrick, when Minister for War, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, they would not have had that day to discuss questions of Army reorganisation. The attack made upon the Government naturally resolved itself into two parts. It was an attack on the Minister for War because he proposed to make these reductions in the *personnel* of the Army. There was not a single Member, he was convinced, who did not go down to his constituents at the last election and say that the reduction of armaments, both naval and military, was essential to the continued well-being of this country.

MR. F. E. SMITH: On the contrary, I said that, in my judgment, the expenditure on the Army and Navy would be more likely to increase than decrease, and ought to increase.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that if the hon. Member stated that, of course as regarded him he withdrew the assertion, but he maintained that what he had said was the general effect of nine-tenths of the election addresses. Lord St. Aldwyn, speaking in the middle of May, expressed the opinion that there was *prima facie* ground for believing that there was room for material reduction in Army expenditure without loss to the efficiency of the Army. After all, the Secretary of State for War in this connection was not merely the chief executive officer of the Government but of the Party, and the Party were as fully responsible as the Minister. Let them not shirk their responsibilities in that respect, because, according to his view, members of the Party were as fully responsible as any Minister. The fact was that the genesis and cause of the whole debate was the versatility and originality of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon. No person had insisted more upon the Army being put upon a non-political basis than that right hon. Gentleman. Two or three days ago even he claimed a non-political discussion of Army Estimates, but then he went down to Grantham, and to the dames of the Primrose League said that he had never seen such an intellectual smash up of any Government as that which had happened to this one.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) said that had nothing to do with the Army. He never said a single word about the Army in the course of that speech. He was not speaking of the Army, but he was speaking of what took place in connection with the debate in the Education Bill, which certainly had struck him in that light.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that if the right hon. Gentleman said that he was bound to accept his withdrawal. ["What withdrawal?"] He would ask the right hon. Gentleman, however, to turn his mind back to some speeches he made in Cornwall in January of this year, when he supposed the right hon. Gentleman felt that the distance from the Metropolis was sufficiently great to secure that there would be less acute an audience than in London. In those speeches he put the whole question of the Army upon a political basis and made not only an attack upon the Secretary of State for War but upon those who sat upon the Ministerial side of the House. He agreed, however, that the topic was an unprofitable one, and he would not further pursue it. What were the proposals put forward by the Secretary of State for War? The right hon. Gentleman proposed to reduce the infantry of the Line by eight battalions and the Guards by two. He also proposed to reorganise the infantry while he left the cavalry alone. Personally he was glad to find that in the reorganisation of the Army he had re-established the system which had served the Army well, and had never been repudiated by any soldier of eminence—he referred to the Cardwell system. In the recent war the only Reservists whose quality was seriously found fault with were Section D, the men who had been longer absent from the colours than four years, and they had been created by the short-service system, which found so enthusiastic a supporter in the right hon. Member for Croydon. On the questions of reductions, he asked—what were the proposals of the right hon. Member for Croydon? The right hon. Gentleman proposed a reduction of fourteen battalions, but he had not the courage to propose a reduction of the Guards' battalions. Then what did the right hon. Member for Croydon propose for the Militia? He wanted to get rid of the old constitutional force; so that if it were a crime to reduce the Auxiliary Forces and the Reserve Forces the right hon. Member for Croydon was far more guilty than the present Secretary for War. Comparing the strength of the country in 1898 and its relative position to-day, even with the proposed reductions we would have seven more battalions of infantry than we had then. Our relations with foreign countries were also better. Before 1898 it was possible that we might find ourselves in conflict with three Powers—Russia, France, and

South Africa. Could any one deny that our relations at that time were in a very strained state? But we had got rid of South Africa by conquest, and Russia by accident, and we had secured the the friendship of France. His right hon. friend had made out a substantial case for the reduction of these battalions, though he was aware that no more unpopular proposal in relation to the Army could be made from the point of view of society than the reduction of the Guards. But the House was not concerned with the needs of society. They had to consider whether in reducing the Guards they were to reduce the more or less costly, or the more or less needed, portions of the Army. Certainly for the purposes of reinforcing colonial and foreign garrisons the Guards battalions were of no use to the nation. [" They are going to Egypt."] Yes, they were going to Egypt in order that they might be absorbed.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: They were going to Egypt for the purposes of reinforcement.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that was so, but in the course of the reinforcement they would be absorbed. What was the reason for the large increase of the Guards in the last ten years? Was it for the purpose of maintaining order in London or to police the country? Certainly not. The proposal of his right hon. friend to reorganise the artillery was also good. There were ninety-three batteries of artillery with guns and without men. That was a very expensive plaything, and these useless batteries were at present swelling the Estimates, and for the payment of them the Secretary for War had to find the money. The former scheme was extravagant and inefficient; it served no purpose in war, but it wasted money in peace, and any scheme which would reorganise the artillery in this direction ought to meet with the approval of this House. The noble Lord had referred to the approval of the Army Council to the proposals laid before the House. That was an element of novelty and originality that they ought to welcome. For the first time for five years the Secretary of State could say that he had the unanimous approval of his military advisers. It had been the fashion to quote Lord Roberts, but Lord Roberts was not the official adviser of the country. There were other persons who were responsible, and these persons, during the tenure of office of the late Secretary of State, could not be quoted in approval of his scheme. Here they had a recognition of the principle that, while the House decided what amount should be spent on the Army itself, the Army Council decided how the money ought to be spent. The Secretary for War could appeal confidently to the unanimous support of his proposals by a proper and constitutional method of allocating military expenditure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it is usual when the adjournment is moved for the Minister chiefly concerned to make an early statement of his views, and if he thinks it necessary to reserve himself for a later stage it is usual for some Member of the Front Bench to give his views to the House before it has proceeded for more than an hour, as it has done to-night. I remember a case in which the then Opposition, not quite so well mannered as the present Opposition, did, when a Member of the Treasury Bench was put up at once, howl at him for an hour because they wanted another Member of the Government to take part in the debate. The Gentleman we want to hear is the Secretary of State for War. Although I do not at all complain of his not having risen immediately, I hope the right. hon. Gentleman will feel that he ought to rise at an early moment. I make no complaint—[a laugh]—although I should have a perfect right to do so basing myself on precedents of which the hon. Member who interrupts me is probably not ignorant. I will very briefly and incompletely tell the right hon. Gentleman what it is we want him to deal with. We have not initiated this debate in order that we may have a chance of discussing the merits of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme. The hon. Member who has just sat down has given us an elaborate defence of the Army changes proposed by the Government. I do not propose to follow him in that, because it is not the merits of the scheme that are before us. We think that we have not had an opportunity of expressing our views on the subject, and the two hours and a quarter given us by the Motion for the adjournment would be an utterly inadequate occasion, and impossible to be used for such a purpose. The Motion on the Paper does not contest the value or the importance of the scheme. What that Motion traverses is the whole policy of the Government as regards its treatment of the House of Commons in connection with the discussion of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme. We desire that a full opportunity should be given on some other occasion for dealing with the important matters brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman. My first question is whether the right hon. Gentleman has any precedent in his Parliamentary experience for a great scheme of Army reform's being brought forward without the House of Commons being given an opportunity of discussing it until it is in process of being carried out—until the Government have taken such steps that cannot be recalled. I do not know of any such case. There have been in our time many prolonged and important discussions on the difficult and complex problem of the British Army. During the last twenty years that problem has presented some of the most difficult questions with which this House can be called upon to deal. But has any Minister of the Crown ever before proposed great changes in a speech to which there was no adequate opportunity of making a reply or even of considering at all? What is the ordinary practice in these matters? The War Minister, on the question that the Speaker do leave the chair, makes a statement with regard to his projects of Army reform, and it has been the common practice to adjourn the debate after that statement in order that the House may have an opportunity of considering it at leisure. Have we been given any opportunity of considering the right hon. Gentleman's statement? Would any adjournment have been tolerated? So far is that from being the case that we spoke under the knowledge, already communicated to us by the Prime Minister, that he was determined that no further time should be given this session for the discussion of Army Estimates.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): This part of the session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Estimates are almost over.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The scheme of my right hon. friend does not refer to the Estimates of this year.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman says we shall have other opportunities. But he made no suggestion, until I pressed him hard the other night, that some further opportunity should be given to us. I suggested that that further time would, according to precedent, extend over some days. Did the right hon. Gentleman consent to that? He refused to give us more than a day. That is a grossly and utterly inadequate allowance of time, if we take into account all that has been done in previous Parliaments. But that is not the main point. At what period in our proceedings is this day to be given? Before or after these changes in the Army have been initiated? If the right hon. Gentleman said that it was to be given before these changes were begun, and that the House would have an opportunity for discussion before the Government was finally committed, the concession would have been more substantial in character. But the right hon. Gentleman said exactly the reverse. He and the Chancellor of the Exchequer elaborately explained to the House that they refused absolutely to be bound by any pledge not to start the destruction of these ten regiments and these 3,000 artillerymen before the House of Commons had had an opportunity of giving an opinion on the subject. I think that is bad enough, but it is aggravated, I must frankly say, by the tenor of the statement of the Secretary for War earlier in the session. There is no man in whose word I have greater confidence than the right hon. Gentleman, but he will admit, on looking over the quotations from his speech, that, whatever he intended, the effect on the House, on this side and on his critics on his own side, could hardly be other than that no great change was intended in the financial year. I think, if he will consider that long paragraph in his first speech about the "mare's nest,"† and if he will remember another quotation which has been referred to to-day, he will admit that whatever explanation his quotations are susceptible of, they were undoubtedly calculated, however unintentionally, to induce all parts of the House to believe that whatever great scheme was maturing for the future for the present it was not intended to enter into any great or drastic Army changes, and by implication it was understood it was proposed to allow the House an opportunity of considering any changes he proposed to make. If I remember rightly, he went further and said full opportunity would be given for discussing his proposals. The quotation has been given by my hon. and learned friend. I am not aware that there was any qualification to that pledge. I am not aware that he desires to make out that it was not an absolute pledge that the House should have full opportunity of discussing any great Army changes, any great reduction, and any destruction of units. Does he desire to support either of two propositions—the proposition that the House has had adequate time for discussion, or the proposition that time should be given before the changes are initiated? Nobody can maintain that adequate time has been given. We know the right hon. Gentleman occupied half the day's sitting, and the remaining half was occupied by Members on his side of the House—able critics, some of them—but not Members of the regular Opposition. It cannot be pretended that full time for discussion has been given. When reproached with this the right hon. Gentleman said something about a mandate from the country, but that there was a mandate to destroy eight regiments of the Line and two regiments of Guards I venture absolutely to deny. That any number of Radical candidates may have announced their intention to vote for a reduction of the Army Estimates I am ready to admit, but to say that vague statements of successful candidates absolve the Government from the duty of allowing discussion of their proposals is a grotesque violation of constitutional practice and theory, and I would fain hope and believe that when the right hon. Gentleman late in the evening referred to this mandate it was without adequate reflection. He has pledged himself to give full opportunity for discussion, and we have not had it. Therefore, I have to ask for the full discussion promised, and I ask, is it to be given before or after the Government are finally committed to these changes? If the Government only mean to allow discussion after the changes are made, then I say that is flouting the House of Commons. It is reducing us to the position of a debating Assembly, allowed to discuss what has been done but incapable of modifying the policy of those whose business it is to carry out the wishes of the people. If that is our position we cease to have any operative control over the Executive, and are allowed only to be critics after the event. I do not think that I can add to the concise statement we have had of the case against the Government. We are not now disputing any part of the Army scheme; it may be the most perfect, the most symmetrical, the most complete method of carrying out Army reform the ingenious and fertile brain of a War Minister ever produced, but that does not affect the question whether the House should be allowed to discuss these great military changes proposed by the Executive or should be shut out from the great duty of criticising. On this point I have no doubt myself, and I hope that when the right hon. Gentleman rises to reply to my brief statement he will be in a position to assure us of two things—that we shall have the full opportunity for discussion promised and that that full opportunity shall not occur at a period which will make all our arguments and contentions vain and words impotent without the possibility of having any effect on a decision already taken.

MR. HALDANE: To anyone who did not know the skill of the right hon. Gentleman as a Parliamentary leader the course which he has taken would cause the utmost amazement. The right hon. Gentleman complains of want of time to discuss the Army scheme, which he says is withdrawn from the House of Commons, and we have two and three-quarters hours until 11 o'clock in the course of which he tells us that he declines to discuss the proposals. We are brought down here for his protest against full opportunity not being given to examine the Army scheme. That was not the tone of the hon. and learned Member opposite, who does not fail in skill; that was not the tone of the noble and gallant Lord who followed him; they seem to be inspired more nearly with the spirit of the right hon. Member for Croydon, who is burning for the fray. Before the battle of Dunbar the Presbyterian leader, General Leslie, had a position of advantage, but induced at last under the inspiration of preachers to descend to the plain, he came under the artillery of his opponent. The right hon. Gentleman has taken a lesson from the event; he is not to be misled by the exhortations of the preachers, he declines to come down from the hills and join issue with us on the merits of the scheme. What has he said? Surely two and three-quarter hours of the time of the House of Commons need not be thrown away for what might have been said in a sentence? I am puzzled by the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman, and the more so when I recall the procedure in similar circumstances of his own Government. They, too, had such a situation, they conceived a plan—I think an admirable plan; I have always commended the wisdom of it—for eliminating useless and extravagant vessels from the Navy. Lord Selborne's policy took effect in December, 1904, when Parliament was not sitting. These vast changes which resulted in the reduction of the Naval Estimates by £5,000,000 and sweeping away many ships were accomplished by a stroke of the executive pen. We are not so bad from a Parliamentary point of view, because we had consulted Parliament. It is not only the great changes made in the reduction of the fleet we have to remember; there was the purchase of the Chilian battleships. What opportunity was given to Parliament to discuss that? There was Lord Cawdor's great revolution in naval training in 1905, upon which the opinion of Parliament was not sought. You are entitled to look at things on their merits and examine them according to their proportions in order to determine how much time you ought to give to their discussion in Parliament. I come to the position before the House, the proposition for adjournment, on which I assume the right hon. Gentleman intends to fix us with a division registering the sense of the iniquity of our proceedings. Let us see what, after all, it is that we are in controversy about. I, it is true, discussed matters on March 8th last in a speech in which the Estimates were introduced. We have not discussed the Estimates at as great a length as they were discussed upon those occasions when I think nineteen days were given to the discussion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon's military schemes on his Estimates. But there is a difference between our schemes and his. We are fairly agreed on this side of the House. The Government, at any rate, is agreed on its policy, and we had a discussion then on which it did not seem to be an absolute certainty that the Government were agreed. That is not all. Our propositions are much more modest than were the propositions of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I pointed out on March 8th that I had no intention of reducing battalions at large. I eliminated altogether from my stroke fighting battalions at home That precluded me from touching the battalions at Aldershot which had been the subject of remark, but I pointed out that in India and in the Colonies there was a great field for reduction of unnecessary units. That topic was quickly taken up and debated not for one night but for two days. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover made a strong speech against the reduction of battalions in the Colonies, and I said—

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 662.

> "I am asking for time. I am giving you warning of the way in which my mind is moving, and when I do come to a decision I will put it fully and fairly before the House."

I did not propose to ask them to come to a conclusion when Parliament was not sitting and when it was impossible to discuss these things, as it was impossible to discuss the reduction of the Navy in the time of the late Government. I proposed, if I could, to make recommendations to my colleagues which they could consider and to bring them before Parliament while Parliament was sitting. We have taken that course. I quite agree the time was short. If right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Gentlemen opposite wish to sit after August 4th a good many hon. Members on this side are zealous, and may possibly be disposed to meet them in a proper spirit. Our propositions are not revolutionary in the sense in which other propositions in military matters have been revolutionary. A proposition cannot be called revolutionary if it is a modification of one made by right hon. Gentlemen sitting opposite. I have in my mind a Parliamentary paper [Cd. 1571], price one half-penny, published in 1904, which is signed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, in which he makes the proposition in a schedule to abolish fourteen battalions of infantry of the Line at home. The House did not agree about his short-service Army, but that was his proposition, and now exception is taken to my proposing to reduce by eight battalions in place of fourteen as if it were something novel and unheard of. I cannot go into this deep plot about the two battalions of the Guards; but I do remember an alarm in 1904 at rumours, doubtless untrue, but I do not observe that the right hon. Gentleman repudiates them, that he had in his mind an idea of reducing two battalions of the Guards, and if all the stories were true the very two battalions which we have been discussing upon the present occasion. I am not going to argue the *tu quoque*, but the concrete proposition that if these are not novel proposals, if they are less than propositions put forward by Members of the Opposition, they cannot be put upon the footing of things as highly controversial, that they require a great time for discussion in this Parliament. I come to the artillery, about which so much has been said. The right hon. Gentleman himself said that to his mind the idea of using the Garrison Militia Artillery for ammunition columns had occurred to him, that he thought the Garrison Militia would be no longer required. He had the very idea I was bringing forward. There was no originality in it. When I heard that I thought that delivered us from very long discussion. It seems I was wrong. I am but a young Minister, a very child in these things. In future I shall not be so sanguine. Now, Sir, I think I have discussed the main points which were raised against me by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London. I do not complain of his making points, but I do complain very much of his having withdrawn from this evening's discussion the whole substance of what we want to get at—the views of the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not got the terms of the Motion, Mr. Speaker, which you put from the Chair, but if I remember rightly it had no reference to the substance of the scheme but only to the question of the power of the House to discuss it. I should have gone beyond that if I had gone into the scheme. May I ask that the Clerk should read the terms of the Motion?

*MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps I had better read the terms of the Motion on which the Member for Liverpool claimed the leave of the House to raise this discussion—

"The avowed intention of His Majesty's Government to commence forthwith the reductions of His Majesty's armed forces which have not received the sanction of Parliament."

MR. HALDANE: I think that the right hon. Gentleman was in the House when the hon. and learned Member for Liverpool spoke, but it may be that he was absorbed in some great consideration of Parliamentary strategy. I took a note of the admirable and moderate speech of the hon. and learned Member, and he told us how he had put it to his constituents that there ought to be no reduction in the cost of the Army. He told us he was in a position to rely on the authority of Lord Roberts, and he discussed Lord Roberts as if he were a prophet of the military school of the late Government and was satisfied with their proceedings. I do not follow him into that. Then the hon. and learned Member went into a discussion of the reduction of the ten battalions and also of the secret of the success of this country, which he put at its keeping up the Army and Navy. It is extremely difficult for me to conduct this debate as the right hon. Gentleman wishes, for he wishes to keep me to a single point—his point—but his supporters travel further.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am delighted to hear the right hon. Gentleman on any subject. Though I kept to one point, I do not wish him to do so.

MR. HALDANE: I cannot after that follow the right hon. Gentleman's example by adhering perfectly closely to the terms of the Resolution to which he has confined himself. We have discussed, I think, in the course of this Army scheme four great subjects, and it seems to me that the controversy between the two sides of the House is only a controversy of detail. I have already said how I consider the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon cannot attack me for reducing eight battalions when he himself proposed to reduce fourteen. I have already said I cannot consider that he can attack me for the changes in the artillery which consist of taking forty-two batteries without ammunition columns and supplying them with ammunition columns—and not only with ammunition columns, but with officers, which they had not got before, and on a very much more economical basis than they are on at the present moment, at a large saving—of course, I know that does not count for anything—and in the opinion, not of the humble civilian who is addressing the House of Commons, but of the most eminent artillerists and of the general staff, in a fashion which gives you a really good arrangement and organisation for the mobilisation of sixty-three batteries against the forty-two we have at the present time. As to the Militia, is there a revolution in the decision to take the Militia and ask them to engage when they enlist to go abroad in time of war? Why, that was the subject of a Bill brought in by the late Government which passed the House of Lords and which was, in the abstract, to form part of a scheme to which the House of Commons showed a tremendous antipathy. The last point, too, I think, was not the subject of much controversy. It was the principle that all organisation should be for war. Is that a principle on which there is much controversy? No, Sir, the whole discussion upon this Army scheme confines itself to the application of a principle on which, I believe, there is no difference on the two sides of the House. We discussed all these things *ad longum* in their initial stages in March for two days. There was a further opportunity of discussing them in connection with the Army Estimates just after Whitsuntide, when I observed that right hon. Gentleman opposite, with the exception of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, were conspicuous by their absence. And, finally, we discussed them for one day just lately, and we have submitted to the opportunity of discussing them for three hours to-night. In these circumstances I am unable to see where the charge of breach of faith comes in or where the ground of complaint comes in. No doubt if the session had been more free from great discussion over other measures, we should have had more time for these matters. But, after all, those on the Opposition side, as well as those on the Government side, must cut their coats according to the cloth they have got, and if there is less cloth for this particular purpose than right hon. Gentlemen wish, I think it is their own fault.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that, though the right hon. Gentleman had claimed the right to go outside the terms of the Motion, he did not intend to do so. They had quite enough matter if they confined themselves to the terms of the Motion. What they wanted to understand was why the pledges given to the House had been broken. He had said, and he repeated, that pledges, unequivocal and clear and reiterated, had been given to the House and all had been broken. He had said that the first pledge was that this matter, this new scheme, should be discussed, and discussed in July. These were the right hon. Gentlemen's words, and he did not think he would deny them—

> "And then there would be ample time for discussion."†

It was absolutely trifling with the House to say that ample opportunity for the discussion of a scheme of this kind had been given in a debate of three hours. Then there was another pledge. There was a pledge with regard to the destruction of battalions. The right hon. Gentleman said practically nothing at all about that. The right hon. Gentleman said perfectly unequivocally, in answer to his hon. friend behind him, that there was no idea whatever of disbanding ten battalions. The right hon. Gentleman that afternoon had said that his reference was to battalions of the Line, and he wished to call attention to a remarkable discrepancy. It was not battalions of the Line to which he had referred but Regular battalions. That was clear enough for him. What was it the right hon. Gentleman told them that afternoon? That in his speech of March 8th he referred to the question of home battalions and that it would be an act of insanity to destroy home battalions. He quite agreed, but what was the right hon. Gentleman going to do? Where were the battalions which were going to be destroyed? One was at Aldershot, another at the Curragh, and two others in Ireland.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 532.

MR. HALDANE said they had brought home eight battalions in order that they might get rid of four linked battalions.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked whether the right hon. Gentleman in the speech he made intended it to be understood or expected that any rational being would understand that he was going to destroy a battalion at the Curragh, a battalion at Limerick, a battalion at Tipperary, a battalion at Aldershot, and two battalions in London. His own belief was that when the right hon. Gentleman made that speech he had not made up his mind at all.

MR. HALDANE: It is absolutely untrue.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he accepted that rather uncourteous disclaimer. The right hon. Gentleman had also stated that he said in the same speech that he proposed to retain the liberty of destroying battalions in the Colonies. There was no such reference in the speech, though there was a reference to the possibility of withdrawing battalions from the Colonies. But let it be supposed the reservation was made. The right hon. Gentleman had stated on March 6th that there was no foundation whatever for the statement that ten Regular battalions were to be reduced; on March 8th he had declared that it would be an act of insanity to destroy ten home battalions. From those two propositions the House and the country were to infer that he did intend to destroy ten battalions. All he could say was that if that was the result of clear thinking it might be with advantage accompanied by a little clear expression. This matter was discussed in the belief that these reductions were not going to take place The right hon. Gentleman had thought fit to twit him with regard to acts which it was suggested he had committed or been about to commit. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he had proposed to reduce fourteen battalions of the Line. That figure did appear in the return presented to Parliament. What words, however, did he use? He said—

> "We shall have to create in these counties territorial battalions and until we have created them we shall not be able to effect the reduction in the existing line battalions which I hope we may ultimately be able to effect."

That was a statement he made many times. The right hon. Gentleman had twitted him with having preceded him in the idea of making the Militia batteries feeders for the Regular batteries in time of war. What did he say then? He said what the right hon. Gentleman had not said, that there could be no more question of taking the whole of these 12,000 or 14,000 Militiamen than of inducing the Brigade of Guards to enlist in the Volunteers. That was the whole difference. The right hon. Gentleman had taken credit for the passage of the whole of this Militia artillery out of their Militia units into the ammunition train of the Regular batteries. If that was not so, what became of all his calculations, of his statement that officers and men had been found when they had been wanting in the past? The right hon. Gentleman had been premature. There was a whole sheaf of questions that day to which he could not give any answer. He had said he was going to give the Volunteer Artillery guns, but he could not say whether the guns were in existence or how they could possibly be paid for. Would it not have been better to have given the House of Commons a little time for discussing these things? The right hon. Gentleman told a yarn—it could be called nothing else—about Lord Selborne and the Navy. He asked the House to look at the comparison. Here was an executive act which they were told was to become operative at once. Lord Selborne issued a memorandum in which he stated that certain ships of the Navy were to be put in the third-class reserve. But absolutely nothing was done to the ships involved until the whole plan had been brought before Parliament and fully discussed on the Navy Estimates and the policy approved. Until he could show some analogy, the Secretary for War could not quote Lord Selborne's action as a precedent. What had been the upshot of this debate? It was impossible to develope arguments fully with the meagre time given to discuss the position of the Army. [Ironical MINISTERIAL Cheers.] Hon. Gentlemen challenged him; but he insisted that the Army was being destroyed. The infantry were to be reduced by 40,000. Moreover, if the right hon. Gentleman wished to destroy the artillery he could not have found a better plan. The effect of wiping out some sixty-seven officers and 3,000 men of the Horse and Field Artillery would be seriously felt in the formation of the Reserve. Where we got 100 men under the old system we should have only forty now. He said, again, that this was really a measure for the destruction of the Army. ["Oh."] The Opposition had shown in this debate that the Secretary for War had on more than one occasion broken faith with the House, and that it was not in accordance with precedent nor the public interest that these great changes should be made by the autocratic will of a Minister, and without any opportunity for discussion before action was taken.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that the gravamen of the charge against the Government was that if the Army was to be reduced Parliament ought to express its opinon upon it quite irrespective of the method by which that reduction was to be made. He asked whether the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, and who threw these charges of bad faith so lightly, did not see that the very Motion carried with it its own solution. Those who thought the Army should be reduced would vote with the Government on this occasion, and those who thought the Army must be maintained in its full strength and at its full expense would vote for this Motion. Then they might proceed to reduce the Army without any question as to whether a reduction should be made without the sanction of Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman opposite said they were going to make a revolutionary change by abolishing ten battalions of the Regular Army. But the right hon. Gentleman had proposed to abolish fourteen battalions. It was true that he proposed to set up another kind of Army, but his own Party objected to it, and he had to drop it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What was proposed was that there should be a reduction of long service battalions and the creation of short service battalions. The gravamen of our charge against the scheme of the Government is that they propose a reduction before they get the substitute. If they will follow our example and will make no reduction before they have got the substitute we shall be content.

MAJOR SEELY said the obvious retort was, "Which example?" The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon had proposed to reduce the Army by fourteen battalions of infantry of the line, and it did not lie in his mouth to call this modest reduction a revolutionary change. He could not help it if people did not make up their own minds. He must be permitted to make one more point in reply to the right hon. Gentleman. If the right hon. Gentleman said it was revolutionary to knock off ten battalions he must point out that the predecessor of the present War Minister had induced the House of Commons by a majority of 190 to adopt a proposal to sweep away six army corps which had previously been said to be necessary for the safety of the country. In regard to these army corps the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon said they might as well call them Sunday school districts. He swept them away by a stroke of his pen and now he complained of a modest reduction.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that he had been the victim of many misquotations that evening. He had never said that the six army corps might be called Sunday school districts, but that it did not matter two straws by what name they were called.

MAJOR SEELY said the right hon. Gentleman could not deny the fact that he swept away the whole system of the six army corps, and therefore he submitted that it did not lie in his mouth to call this modest reduction of ten battalions a revolutionary change. When the right hon. Gentleman himself had swept away six army corps he came down and said that to reduce the Army by 20,000 men was to destroy the Army. Had the right hon. Gentleman forgotten that he himself said that the men were not there to be destroyed? It was not very revolutionary to abolish 20,000 men when the right hon. Gentleman had informed the House that the 20,000 men were not there to be abolished, and they knew they could not enlist them. It was a case of the pot calling the kettle black, and it was not a very profitable discussion, although it was one in which Mr. Brodrick and the right hon. Gentleman might engage between themselves. When, however, the right hon. Gentleman came down and lightly made these charges of bad faith he thought it was time that the House of Commons should express an opinion upon the right hon. Gentleman's own action. He had nothing to complain of in the language of the mover of the Resolution or of that of the noble Lord who seconded, who contended that it was not desirable to reduce the Army. He only complained of the charges of bad faith. It had been argued that if an expeditionary force were dispatched abroad we should have only 56,000 men left for the defence of the country. His own impression was that the number would be very much larger, namely, some 300,000 men, and he did not think we need be under any apprehension. The calculation omitted all the Volunteers and Auxiliary Forces which his right hon. friend hoped to include in his scheme. On the general question, they must see that we could not maintain a Regular Army fit to cope with the great problems of a possible great war. Our Army could not possibly be anything but a nucleus and an example, and the only way to make it a nucleus and a real example was to pick and choose and to take only the best men—[" What about the Guards?"]—and see that they were armed with the best weapons. He honestly believed that by reduction the Army would increase its efficiency and that the charge of bad faith could not be sustained.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he made no complaint of the inconsistency of the hon. Member for the Abercromby Division, because it was the hon. Gentleman himself who on the March 8th last moved a reduction of the Army by 10,000 men. The present Secretary of State protested against the Motion, and in the division that took place on the 15th the Government was saved by the Opposition. He himself was approached by the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, who said, "I hope you are not going to leave the House, because if you are we shall be beaten." He remembered his distinctly saying that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Abercromby Division went to a division the Government would be beaten.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said he had no recollection of any such declaration upon his part, and it was certainly one he would never have made to his hon. and gallant friend.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said he held in his hand the division list of the division taken upon the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member. The majority was fairly large, the Ayes were 56 and the Noes were 296. That majority was largely made up of the votes of the Opposition in consequence of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State stating that he had no intention of making any reduction in the Army. The right hon. Gentleman therefore had no intention to reduce the Army by even 10,000 men. He had shown great capacity and industry in his present office, but he was doing himself an injustice by forcing this scheme of reduction of 20,000 men without consultation with the House of Commons. When last March the right hon. Gentleman said he would make his statement on July 12th he gave a distinct pledge that there should be ample opportunity for discussion. On July 15th the Prime Minister said there would not be any further opportunity given for discussion, and that the right hon. Gentleman was quite at liberty to proceed with his scheme. He had hoped the right hon. Gentleman would to-night have stated in reply to his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, that he would not proceed with this policy, of which he declared himself to be the unwilling instrument, until the House had had full time to discuss it. It was absolutely useless for the Secretary of State for War to hurl invective against the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon. When the right hon. Member for Croydon was Secretary of State for War he (Sir Howard Vincent) did not approve of the measure which was proposed, and he said he would never make the Army a Party question. The proposals of the right hon. Gentleman were not approved by many of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters, and there was no reason why they should consent to this reduction of 20,000 without the matter having been discussed by the House. The right hon. Gentleman had declared that at no previous time was the Army in a more efficient condition than when he took over office, and that never before this time had they such good material in the Army; that the *morale* of both the officers and the men was as good as ever it was. That was high praise of the right hon. Member for Croydon, from whom he took over the seals of office. Yet what did the right hon. Gentleman do? He cut away eight battalions of the line, and two battalions of the Guards, and made reductions in the artillery which even now had not sufficient men to mount the guns. But whatever he had or had not done, what the Government had to do was to look at the present position of the empires of the world. Was this the moment to reduce the Army by 20,000? Reference had been made to an alleged mandate, but there was not a single Member, so far as he could ascertain, who had ever, in his election address or in the speeches he made to the electorate, advocated the abolition of ten battalions.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Oh yes.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Who did?

MR. BYLES: I did.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said his hon. friend was capable of many things which were aimed at the destruction of the Empire. He did not think even the hon. Member, whose views were well known, would recommend that three battalions should be taken away from South Africa at the present time. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies told his constituents the other day that it was a message of sympathy that they should send to the white community in South Africa whose lives and fortunes might at any time be swept into an abyss. To meet the situation the Secretary of State for War proposed to remove three battalions of regular infantry. It was not alone a question of South Africa. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs recently gave a solemn warning to the House. The right hon. Gentleman said that if the House of Commons did anything at this moment to weaken or destroy the authority of the Government as it existed in Egypt they would be face to face with a very serious situation. Lord Cromer, speaking of the rise of Moslem fanaticism against the Christian population, said that a permanent increase would have to take place in the numbers of the British Garrison in Egypt. And this was the moment when the Secretary of State for War and his party chose to reduce the Army by 20,000 men, and not only that but they removed battalions from Malta and Gibraltar, places where they would most likely be wanted. The right hon. Gentleman was doing himself a grave injustice. He had no fault to find, but rather gratitude to express, for the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman had taken up with regard to the Auxiliary Forces. But he knew of no information which would justify the assumption that 30,000 Militia and 3,000 Yeomanry would be ready in the event of war to go abroad. No guarantee that he was aware of had been given by the commanding officers of Militia as a whole, and the Secretary of State for War had no right at such a time to propose to abandon 20,000 of the regular Army unless he had a scheme of expansion ready. The moment was inopportune for this reduction, and he believed the right hon. Gentleman was giving way to the pressure of his own party without full consideration of the merits of the case. Two Guards' battations were to be done away with, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman was hoping that circumstances might arise to save him from this reduction because he was compelled to send one of the battalions which he was proposing to reduce to reinforce the garrison at Egypt. If proof were needed of the absurdity of reducing the Army at the present time, it was shown in the action of the right hon. Gentleman in sending the Coldstream Guards to Egypt. He was only expressing the views of his constituents in opposing the reduction of the Army. He had received a telegram as follows—

> "Hope Haldane's proposals will improve soldier's lot, with no reductions of the Army."

That was from Mr. Greenwood, the secretary of the Liberal Association. The promise he had made to his constituents was to resist this reduction of the Army by all possible means.

MR. WARD rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but MR. SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he rose to contradict in the most absolute way the statements made by the hon. Member for East Bristol as regarded the Guards' Brigade. It had fallen to the lot of the hon. Member alone to attempt by a studied insult to cast a slur upon a body of men who had never claimed to be any better than the rest of His Majesty's troops, but who at all events comprised men who had done their duty in every portion of the globe to which they had been sent.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I am absolutely unaware of having said anything which was an insult, studied or otherwise, to the Guards. May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to quote the words to which he has alluded?

COLONEL LOCKWOOD said he had been present during the whole debate, and had taken the precaution of taking down the words. The hon. Member talked of the bravery of reducing the Guards, whose principal use was to police London, and of the glitter and glamour of the Brigade of Guards. The whole speech was so evidently meant as an insult [Cries of "No, no," and "Withdraw"] that he should be ashamed of himself if he did not take the opportunity to repudiate it most strongly. He maintained that the Secretary for War had not given a reason for reducing the battalions of Guards, and no one would contend that they were not as efficient as other battalions in the Army.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I give an absolute contradiction to what the right hon. Gentleman has said. I said that it was an unpopular thing to reduce the battalions of Guards. [Cries of "Society."] Is that anything against the Guards?

COLONEL LOCKWOOD said that a truth which was half a truth was very difficult to meet, but he adhered to what he had said. Surely they were entitled to ask the Government to give some reason for singling out the Guards for reduction. He wished to point out that it took seven years to make a good artilleryman, and the right hon. Gentleman was now proposing to fill up their ranks with Militiamen. Those who were interested in the Army had a right to demand some reason why the Guards had been chosen for reduction.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said it was unwise to make such large reductions until they knew how the new national Army which had been foreshadowed by the right hon. Gentleman would turn out. It would be far more reasonable to give the national Army a fair trial, and then if it succeeded they might proceed to reduce the Army. He could well imagine our foreign foes rejoicing over such a prospect as was now before them. Was the British Army so strong and our vast Imperial responsibilities so insignificant that at a critical time like that which existed in North and South Africa at the present moment we could afford to reduce the Army by a single man?

MR. HALDANE rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY, who continued his speech amid cries of "Divide, divide," said that no lover of England could contemplate the reductions which had been proposed, with a light heart. They had to uphold a great Empire and they had to safeguard the interests of millions of people abroad.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY said in conclusion he wished to say *qui desiderat pacem praeparet bellum*, which for the information of hon. Members opposite he might explain meant that he who desired peace should be prepared for war.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Motion for Adjournment lapsed without Question put.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Major Anstruther-Gray.

DEANERY OF MANCHESTER BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) moved that the Bill be read a second time this day three months, as no explanation had been given by the Government. He thought they were entitled to know what this Bill was intended to do. Why should they pass it in dumb show?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am in charge of this Bill. Its object is fully explained in a memorandum which has been circulated. The effect of the measure is this. There were certain houses provided for the dean and canons of Manchester. A few years ago, these houses having become unsuitable for that purpose, an enactment was passed dealing with the interest of the canons, and there was a new arrangement of their income whereby they received a small sum of the value of the houses that they had had the use of before. They were provided with houses in a more convenient part of the city. But the dean was left with his house—a house in one of the most valuable and busy streets in Manchester—and the property had become of great value. The dean received in emoluments £1,000 as dean and £500 as resident clergyman—£1,500 a year, a very ordinary sum for the dean. But besides that the late dean enjoyed £1,100 a year because of the enhanced value of the site of the house which he no longer used, that site having been let on a long lease and a premium having been received. A regular deanery was erected in a better part of the city. But he received the £1,100 in addition to the ordinary emoluments of the deanery. This appeared to me and to the ecclesiastical authorities—the Church Estates Commissioners—to be a state of things which ought to be set right—that the dean's office should be dealt with in the same way as the offices of the canons were dealt with on the previous occasions. That is the object of this Bill. The dean in future will not enjoy this £1,100 a year. He will live in the house provided elsewhere. He will have all the emoluments which properly belong to the office, and the sum which is taken fron the general emoluments of the late dean will be applied to the enhancement of the capitular funds, so that the Church in the locality will get the benefit. That is a simple, straightforward, and commonsense arrangement. I believe there is no objection from any quarter, and in the somewhat unaccustomed part of ecclesiastical reformer I have to submit the measure to the House.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY thanked the Prime Minister for his lucid explanation of the purpose of the Bill. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

OPEN SPACES BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. CLAUDE HAY moved that the Bill be read a third time upon this day three months. Why should this Bill be passed *sub silentio?* Before it became law its meaning should be made clear to the House of Commons. There were many points in the Bill which required explanation. It had been said that the Bill had been before a Standing Committee, but hon. Members who had worked upstairs during the present session knew that these Committees had had too much to do, and that Bills had been rushed through without fair and full discussion. ["No."] Those who had not seen eye to eye with hon. Members on the opposite side of the House had the greatest difficulty in getting a fair hearing. He insisted that it was incumbent on the Government to say what they were going to do on the Report stage. That was the only reason why he had proposed his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words, 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he hoped the opposition to the Bill would be withdrawn. The Bill was merely a measure of consolidation.

Amendment negatived.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

As amended, considered.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that he had put an Amendment on the Paper because of a most scandalous attack which had been made on an hon. Member by an Irish Journal, but he did not intend to persist with that Amendment.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) said he wished to move an Amendment which was really intended to protect the very poorest of the King's subjects. He put it to all Parties in the House and to all impartial men whether it was a reasonable thing to pick up a poor hawker on Ludgate Hill and put him in the dock and ask him to prove his innocence. These poor men did not realise that they were doing anything wrong; they were only anxious to earn something for the support of their wives and children. He contended that this clause was making one law for the rich and another law for the poor. He said again that proceedings should be taken not against the hawker, but the publisher of the music.

*Mr. SPEAKER said he must invite the hon. Member to come to the Amendment.

Mr. BYLES said he did not wish to show any animosity against publishers or composers; indeed, he had a personal friend who lived upon royalties obtained from musical compositions.

*Mr. LUPTON said that according to the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed in 1904 to inquire into this question an experienced publisher—Mr. Day—said it required experience to distinguish between a copyright which was in force and one which was run out. He had himself produced in that House a piece of music which had no printer's or publisher's name upon it, which was not copyright, and it being impossible, or at all events difficult, for an ordinary man to distinguish between copyright and non-copyright music, why should these ignorant hawkers be made responsible? A man might sell one piece of music and, being in the right, would go free, and he might sell another and, being in the wrong, be sent to gaol. The Government had refused to accept an Amendment with regard to the registration of copyrights, and therefore he supported the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word "work" to insert the words, 'which he knows to be pirated.'"—(*Mr. Byles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*The HOME SECRETARY (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) said no doubt the hon. Member had spoken in assertion of what he thought was a public principle, but he hoped the House would forgive him for traversing the same ground over which they went the night before last. He thought his hon. friend had considerably exaggerated the effects of this Bill if it passed. Supposing it passed, if his hon. friend were to attempt to sell pirated music the magistrate would ask him to account for the possession of it. If he could not do so, then and then only would any penalty be inflicted. All he would have to show was that he was justified in selling the music and that it was innocently in his possession. He hoped the House might now be allowed to proceed with the Bill.

Mr. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) supported the Amendment. Unless it were adopted the real criminal would not be dealt with, but the least corrupt of the parties concerned would be proceeded against. There were three parties concerned, the one the producer of the pirated music, the other the seller, and then there was the man who purchased it, knowing it to be pirated. In his view the greatest criminality existed on the part of the man who purchased the music knowing it to be pirated. This was the real criminal, because if there were no purchasers there would be no sellers. There seemed to be no intention on the part of the promoters of this Bill to go for the real offender. This was the worst kind of class legislation, because it was unaccompanied by any safeguards.

Mr. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) supported the speech of his hon. friend. The ordinary principle of law was that a man was to be considered innocent until he was proved guilty.

* Mr. GLADSTONE said they had spent three or four hours in discussing this matter the night before, and the question was then considerably argued by the Attorney-General, who dealt with the law.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that if the right hon. Gentleman would look at the Bill he would find it contained a very curious innovation of the law. It constituted a common constable a judge of the law of copyright. If a constable saw a man with certain copies of music and formed the opinion that those copies were pirated copies and that the man had them in his possession for sale, he could apprehend him. The hon. and learned the Attorney-General might be walking in the street and might buy a copy of "Dolly Gray" at Charing Cross. A constable seeing the music sticking out of his pocket might form the opinion that it was pirated music and was for the purposes of sale in the possession of the hon. and learned Gentleman, whom he might take to the station. That was the position to which they had come, that a constable was to arrest without warrant. He could only say that during the time he had been in Parliament he had never known such a prostitution of its proceedings.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he did not object to this Bill. He was in favour of it if the Amendment was carried. But this was an attempt to introduce into the law of the land the principle that if a man could not prove his innocence he was to be held to be guilty. The Bill was just as good without this objectionable clause, and he was astonished that a Liberal Government should go out of their way to try and alter the law of the land in this most objectionable way. He hoped the Government would allow this objectionable clause to be taken out of the Bill. In every other law that he knew of they had to prove every step before they got a conviction, and he could not see why that should not be done in this case. He hoped the Government would allow the clause to be eliminated and thus make this Bill fit to be placed on the British Statute Book.

*MR. BERTRAM (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) said that as perhaps the only musical composer in the House he might be allowed to say he thought it was an abuse of the forms of the House that after the long discussion which had taken place upon this Amendment during the Committee stage, there should be this debate upon it on Report. The present remedy was for the composer to bring an action for damages against anybody who pirated his music. But the Bill as amended in effect provided for the infliction of a fine for the first offence, for which the accused hawker could not be imprisoned, and the whole ground on which the opposition to the clause rested had been cut away. The hon. Member for North Louth had referred to the risk incurred by the street vendor of music which might not be pirated of arrest by a constable who might suddenly take it into his head to run him in. Procedure of a similar kind for the forcible seizure of pirated music had been effected under the Act of 1902. A composer whose music had been pirated found the music being sold, say at Trafalgar Square, by two or three men. He purchased a copy, and having done so he went to a magistrate and asked him to assist him by sending a constable to take the music away from the man and destroy it. At the present time this was the only remedy the composer had. The grievance from which they suffered required special remedies, and it seemed to him that there was no call for the House to encourage these street hawkers of music pirated or not pirated, for whose immunity some hon. Gentlemen were so solicitous.

*MR. LUPTON pointed out that not one word had been said in defence of selling pirated music. They simply asked for justice.

*MR. BERTRAM said the remedy provided by this Bill was a perfectly proper one. The hawker for the first offence was not subjected to imprisonment but to a fine, and he would receive the most considerate treatment from the magistrate because he would recognise that he had not got the real offender before him. He hoped the House would not vary the decision it came to on the previous Monday.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) remarked that it had been said that with regard to the sale of pirated music under the present law that there was no remedy. He presumed that hon. Members did not know that the so-called king of the pirates was at present in gaol suffering a term of nine months imprisonment. It was perfectly true that there was thought to be no remedy, but it was discovered that there was a remedy, and that it was sufficient to enable them to put the king of the pirates into prison. Therefore he could not see that there was any reason for straining one of the fundamental principles of English law. The other question that he wished to allude to was this. There was an assumption underlying the remarks of those who supported the Bill that it was perfectly easy to tell a pirated copy because it contained no publisher's name. But there was nothing to prevent a false name being put upon a piece of music, and in that case there would be no possibility of prosecuting a man because there would be a name on the copy. A third point was that under this Bill there was no prosecutor to take upon himself the responsibility for actions. This was an important question. The reason of this Amendment was that the Joint Committee which sat on the question recommended that there should be a prosecutor who should come forward and be responsible. The Bill said that an ordinary policemen was to be the judge of whether certain music was pirated music, and also of whether the man who had it in his possession intended to sell it. A little while since in a market place of one of the towns in this country, he saw a hawker of music who must have had 2,000 pieces of music, tied up in bundles, in his cart. It would not be surprising if a policeman took those bundles and found one piece of pirated music. Then he could take the man and lock him up and keep him until he was satisfied of his *bona fides.* He thought the House should be very careful how they made this new departure. He did not say that it was not necessary, but what he did say was that proof had not been given of its necessity, and in the absence of proof of necessity they ought not to pass this measure. Supposing a policeman arrested a man, he would be placed in the strange position of having to prove his innocence, and in that case he would be absolutely powerless to get damages from anyone. He did not think the police were the class of men who ought to be the judges whether music was pirated or not, or whether a man should sell it or not. Nor did he think that policemen should be absolutely absolved from all responsibility if they made a cruel mistake by arresting an innocent person. There was a growing necessity that at any rate they should not narrow the market for cheap music. The music trade of this country was in a most unsatisfactory condition, and it had always resolutely resisted any attempt to have a registration of music in anything like a regular form. A publisher simply registered a title like "Love me my darling" and the rest of it, and that was all, and yet they were seeking all these extraordinary powers. The trade was asking for restrictive legislation which had not been asked for by any other trade in this country. The Bill broke a fundamental principle of English law, and the music trade ought to be obliged to prove that it had done everything to put its house in order before asking the House of Commons to pass legislation of this kind. In regard to music the home trade was within a ring-fence, and not only publishing and selling but the singing of music was also in the hands of a syndicate.

THE CHAIRMAN said he thought the hon. Member was getting rather wide of the Amendment.

MR. HARWOOD in conclusion hoped the House would not take such an extraordinary step without being convinced of the absolute necessity for a Bill of this character.

MR. R. PEARCE (Staffordshire, Leek) said he should like to have an assurance that the prosecutor would have to prove that the music was copyright.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said he wished to intervene at this stage in order that he might remove a misapprehension which appeared to exist amongst a large section of the House in reference to the procedure under this Bill. Supposing a man was found selling pirated music in the street, he might be apprehended by a constable if he thought there were reasonable grounds for suspecting that the man was committing an offence within the section. That was no novelty in law. A constable had that discretion now and might exercise it in connection with all kinds of offences in the metropolis. The police at the present time had power to arrest persons whom they suspected of criminal offences. With regard to the prosecution, there must of course be a prosecutor, and some person would have to come before the magistrate and declare that the music of which he was the owner, or which belonged to some person whom he represented, had been pirated. The first step was to show that the music alleged to have been pirated was protected by copyright, and in order to prove that fact the necessary evidence would be the production of a copy of the register showing that that particular piece of music was on the register and protected by copyright. The second step was to show that the particular copies incriminated had been published without the permission of the owner of the copyright and were pirated. He believed it was the universal practice that all authors of published music had their names on the face of the music. It also contained the name of the printer and publisher. Music a hundred years old was not the subject of copyright. He was dealing with music which was the subject of copyright. If it was shown that a hawker was in possession of music which was pirated and appeared to be so owing to the absence of the name of the publisher or the printer, a *prima facie* case was established, and therefore every magistrate would say to the defendant, "You are selling music which, on the face of it, appears to be pirated. What explanation have you to give of coming into possession of that music?" In that way the onus was thrown on the hawker to prove his innocence. In other words, he had to remove the inferences which under the circumstances pointed against him. That was not unreasonable. If the hawker could show that he was not aware that the music in his possession was unauthorised, that would be a good answer, or if he could show that the music was given him in a bundle and that he had had no opportunity of opening it and seeing it, the magistrate would have reason to suppose that he was innocent. In the event of a conviction, the aggrieved person could ask the magistrate to state a case for appeal.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 69; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 239.)

AYES.

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Brigg, John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Herbert J. C.(Tynemouth
crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Dobson, Thomas, W.
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fullerton, Hugh
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hall, Frederick
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T. F. (Wolverh'mpton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Armitage, R.
Baker, Joseph A(Finsbury, E.)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn,W. (T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred

Boland, John
Boulton, A.C.F. (Ramsey)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Bryce, Rt. Hn James (Aberdeen
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fletcher, J. S.
Fuller, John Michael F.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col. Edw. J.
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, R.E.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that the Amendment standing in his name had been recommended by the Departmental Committee, and he hoped it would be accepted.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 14, after the word 'constable' to insert 'if instructed in writing by the owner of the copyright or his agent.'" (*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. T. M. HEALY was rather surprised at the Government not attending to the protest of Members on their own side of the House. He had always noticed that whenever a Liberal Government was in office the most daring jobs were perpetrated, and that the Government were hoodwinked. He should like to see the Tory Party endeavouring to carry through a job of this sort with a vigilant Radical Opposition. The Tory Party would not have ventured to deal with the matter in this way. This Amendment opened up a question of enormous importance. The Bill had been presented as a measure in the interest of the poor musical composer, who, however, only got a royalty of about twopence a copy from the publisher for his song, while the publisher robbed him and would continue to rob him under the *aegis* of this Bill of the other profits of his work. No word of sympathy was said for the poor composer in regard to that matter. What it was sought to secure by this Amendment was that the prosecution should not be an anonymous one, and that the police constable should not arrest a hawker at the instance of a wealthy syndicate, without some one being personally responsible to the person arrested. He had always understood that the Liberal Party were the champions of public liberty and yet they were at the instance of wealthy syndicates going to deprive subjects of their liberty. Somebody should be put forward other than a common informer, who would be answerable in an action for malicious prosecution. Was that an unreasonable proposal? Certainly not. Songs might be claimed to be copyright, while other people said they were not copyright. There might be different versions of the same song — there were hundreds of versions of "The Wearing of the Green." The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool might himself write a version of it and claim copyright of that version. A constable might arrest, and then the hon. Member might say it was a mistake and no one would be answerable. The Amendment simply asked that some responsible person should be put forward. If it was true as had been stated that there was an enormous amount of capital behind these owners of copyright was it not right that they should come forward and say that they were responsible and not the police constable? In Ireland they had had reason to complain of harsh police measures. When the Conservative Government were in office if they attempted a job it would be denounced by the Liberal Party, but now that they had a Liberal Government in office the whole of that Party were silent.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he did not rise before because he was not sure whether this Amendment was seriously put forward, and he noticed that the hon. and learned Gentleman who had attacked the Liberal Party did not go into the argument of the result upon the Bill if the Amendment were agreed to. It was perfectly clear that if it was adopted it would make a mockery and a farce of the Bill. There were 400 or 500 owners of copyrights in London and some 16,000 publications, and it came to this that 400 or 500 publishers would have to write 16,000 letters in order to empower a constable to arrest a man however outrageous his offence might be. He did not think the proposal could be defended.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) felt quite certain that they were right in discussing this question. He did not understand what the Home Secretary was endeavouring to lay down about the policeman being instructed to prosecute. In ordinary cases the police would not arrest anybody unless somebody undertook to attend, charge, and prosecute them. In this case the police constable should be instructed by somebody. He was exceedingly sorry that the Members of the Liberal Party should have to depend upon the hon. Member for North Louth for protection; they had in the past endeavoured to protect the Irish people, but now it seemed that they had sunk to such a low level that they had to depend upon the hon. Member for North Louth for protection. The Amendment merely provided that the policeman should have the authority of somebody before he instituted a prosecution, and he could not understand the objection to a proposal of that kind.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said the description of the Home Secretary of the position was a travesty of the Amendment. It was not necessary that 16,000 letters should be written.

MR. CREAN supported the Amendment because it was in his opinion a reasonable Amendment. In an ordinary case a constable could not arrest without complaint, and in this case he believed it was only right that a man who had a grievance against a hawker should first lodge a complaint. It was a tall order to say that a policeman should on his own authority arrest a man without a warrant and take him to the court.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.) said when this Bill was once in operation a man would be cast into prison, and would have the onus cast upon him to prove his innocence. If a man were apprehended unjustly it was not right that he should have the responsibility of proving his innocence cast upon him. Someone should be responsible for proving the guilt of the person arrested.

MR. O'HARE (Monaghan, N.) said he was one of those who took part in the debate on this extraordinary measure on the Committee stage and every other when it was before the House. In his opinion whenever a Government gave anything to a particular Party which it did not give to the country at large that Government was done. When a committee had charge of a previous Bill some of the most important Amendments were discussed on both sides.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member must confine himself to the Amendment before the House.

MR. O'HARE said he could scarcely avoid making a reference to the great change that had come over certain Gentlemen since they had come into office. The Amendment before the House had a most vital reference to the liberty of the subject. The entire House was animated by the same feeling. In a previous Bill the Committee which considered it was composed of some very eminent men and they rejected proposals similar to those contained in this Bill. He thought no case had been made out for passing this Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER invited the hon. entleman to come to the Amendment.

MR. O'HARE said the point of the Amendment was that there should should be some responsible person who could be sued in case an injustice was done to the person arrested, and upon whom the person wrongly arrested might fall back to obtain redress. Where was the machinery in this Bill which provided a responsible individual who could be proceeded against? He appealed to the Attorney-General to exercise a little independence in this matter and to realise for once that there was a sense of justice even in the Liberal Party.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that on the last Amendment the Labour Party voted in the minority, but in regard to this Amendment they agreed with the Home Secretary. There was one matter, however, which he would like explained in order to remove some uneasiness from his mind. He objected to any policeman having the power to take a man into custody and keep him there until somebody turned up to prove that the piece of music he was charged with pirating was copyright. He would like the Attorney-General to give them some idea of the procedure from the time the man was arrested to the time the copyright was proved. Surely, somebody ought to be associated with the charge against the man who was arrested. In ordinary cases it was the proprietor of the property which had been stolen or injured, and until they were assured in regard to the position of the prosecutor in this matter he thought they ought to resist the measure.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said the police would no doubt have instructions given to them with regard to songs which were being sold and pirated and which were the subject of copyright. If a man's property had been stolen they could give instructions to the police to apprehend any person who was suspected of having this property. If the police had reasonable grounds for suspecting a person they were entitled to arrest him. Having taken a person into custody they could take him to the nearest police station, where there was always a superior officer known as the inspector, who exercised a very wide discretion. The inspector would hear the nature of the complaint and ascertain whether in his view the grounds of suspicion were reasonable, and whether they were adequate to justify the retention of the person suspected. The inspector could decide whether the person accused should be allowed to go to his home without bail or whether it was a case in which a person ought to be detained in custody. That was the general rule with regard to all cases under the law in operation in the Metropolis. With regard to those cases he did not understand that there was any difficulty. No constable would venture to arrest a man for selling pirated music unless he had received some instructions. He must know what music was pirated, and he was entitled to arrest a person if he had reasonable grounds of suspicion that a man was selling pirated music. In such a case he could take a man into custody and take him to a police-station where he would be brought face to face with the inspector. If the inspector ascertained that he was a respectable man and that his residence was well known, or that there was really no ground for supposing that he was intentionally selling pirated music then he could let him go. On the other hand, if the inspector thought the man knew he had no authority to sell that music or had no address, and could not give sufficient security to answer a summons, then of course he would be kept in custody. This Amendment said that there must be an instruction in writing. But there was no such thing known in any other department of the criminal law. It was monstrous to say that you could not put a law into motion without having a document in the shape of a written authority. Even under the present law they could say to a constable "Arrest that man. I will be responsible."

MR. LUPTON asked if he omitted the words "in writing" would that meet the question.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said the words were not necessary because no constable would act on his own responsibility unless he was satisfied that there had been a breach of the law. It was only where the case was not clear and where the constable did not think he was justified in acting upon his own responsibility that he would not act, but if someone came to the policeman and gave the man in charge, then the arrest could be made. The whole proceedings were under the Summary Jurisdiction Act which were incorporated under this section. There would have to be placed before the magistrate an information and some person would have to prove the case on oath. All the facts necessary to constitute a *prima facic* case must be proved on oath, and unless that was done the defendant would not be called upon to prove his innocence. They would have to prove first that the music was pirated. Therefore there was nothing exceptional as regarded procedure under this Bill.

*MR. H. H. MARKS said he thought the Attorney-General had made out a perfect case for this Amendment provided there was some slight modification of its terms. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had stated that the proceedings under this Bill were similar to proceedings under existing laws in other cases where property had been stolen. In cases of theft of goods the usual procedure was to instruct a constable to take certain steps, and the object of this Amendment was that when a similar thing took place in the case of pirated music there should be a similar procedure. The object was to secure that if he saw his music was being pirated the owner of the copyright or his representatives should be able to instruct the constable to take proceedings. After someone had been arrested and taken to the police station the person whose music was pirated would, of course, be communicated with, and he would become the prosecutor. The object of this Amendment was to secure that the prosecutor should be communicated with before the arrest, in order that he might instruct the police, and he ventured to suggest that if the words "in writing" were omitted the Amendment would put the law with respect to pirated music on the same footing as the law with respect to other offences.

SIR JOHN WALTON said he did not say that in all cases the constable only acted on instructions. There were cases in which a constable would decline to act upon his own responsibility, and on the other hand there were cases in which he would act upon his own responsibility. Both those cases were provided for in this Act.

MR. LUPTON said he was willing to amend his Amendment by omitting the the words "in writing."

*MR. SPEAKER: Order! order! The hon. Member has already spoken.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 44; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 240.)

AYES.

Barnes, G. N.
Byles, William Pollard
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cooper, G. J.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Deany, William
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fullerton, Hugh
Glover. Thomas
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pollard, Dr.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lupton and Mr. Claude Hay.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cairns, Thomas
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Farrell, James Patrick
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fletcher, J. S.
Fuller, John Michael, F.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald

Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. T. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, P.
Taylor, Theodore C (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Toulmin, George
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. CREAN moved to add the words "if such person has already been convicted of an offence under this Act." The object of the Amendment was to prevent a person who might be selling pirated music for the first time from being liable to arrest by a constable. He considered this protection necessary in case of the sellers of music who had not been convicted of selling pirated music. If a constable had no knowledge of a man's criminality he should not have the power of arrest as proposed by the clause as it stood. It was a power which the officer should only be allowed to exercise in the case of a person against whom a previous conviction was recorded. He believed the sellers of pirated music were not numerous, and it was not desirable that a constable should be authorised to brand a man by taking him to a police station on suspicion of being engaged in this illegal trade.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 16, at end, to add the words 'if such person has already been convicted of an offence under this Act.'"—(*Mr. Crean.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. MORTON seconded the Amendment.

SIR JOHN WALTON said that the Amendment would put offenders under this Act into an altogether exceptional and anomalous category. There was no sufficient ground for such a proposal.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that there seemed to be some occult and mysterious reason for the promotion and propagation of this Bill. He held that copyright was not property in a true sense, but only in a technical sense. Parliament had fixed a date when it would cease to be property even in a technical sense. They all knew that Milton only got £5 for "Paradise Lost," and he remembered that Lord Byron once presented Mr. Murray, the celebrated publisher, with a Bible, in which he scratched out a word and added another, with the result that a certain passage, instead of reading "Now Barabbas was a robber," appeared "Now Barabbas was a publisher." That was simple Bible teaching. This Bill, he insisted, was not for the protection of the composer or man of genius, but was drawn in the interest of a close corporation as contemptible and as selfish as any on the Rand. Supposing a police constable saw a man selling music which he said was pirated, and the man said he was not doing so, then the constable would have to prove it; he would bring the man before a magistrate, and if he secured a conviction he would put the brand of criminality upon him. In the case of women who were selling street music, were they to be run in simply to satisfy the composers who got so much a copy? It was useless to say that these things would not happen, because this was a Bill which would be permanent. It was in fact a Bill for all time, and they would never probably have the opportunity of reviewing it. Once an Act was passed in the House it was a very difficult thing to get it repealed. Let them take the case of the Irish Crimes Act; the House had passed Resolutions in favour of its repeal again and again, but it had not been repealed. When they saw on the one side a virulent body of prosperous supporters pushing a measure through the House against poor hawkers on the other side who were not represented, might he not use the words of the Attorney-General and say that there was a reasonable suspicion as to the motives of those who promoted the Bill? If this were an ordinary Bill, moved in an ordinary manner, the Amendments which had been moved would have been accepted by the Government. He said that there was some occult mystery connected with the promotion and propagation of the Bill, and he was entitled to assume the attribute which was given under the measure to every constable and to have a reasonable suspicion as to the cause.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 151 (Division List No. 241.)

AYES.

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Barnes, G. N.
Byles, William Pollard
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Delany, William
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fullerton, Hugh
Glover, Thomas
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Wardle, George J.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Crean and Mr. Sheehan.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Armitage, R.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brodie, H. C.
Cairns, Thomas
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Farrell, James Patrick
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'd
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip

Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Starkey, John R.

Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
Whitehead, Rowland
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. MORTON said he desired to move to add at the end of the first clause the words "shall remain in force only to December 31st, 1910."

MR. SPEAKER said that could only be expressed in the form of a new clause. The effect of the Amendment was to limit the duration of the Bill, and it would not be in order to move it now. It should have been taken first as a new clause.

Bill to be read a third time upon Monday next.

MARRIAGE WITH FOREIGNERS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

SIR E. CARSON said he thought the Amendment he had to move was necessary to make the Bill clearer. Anyone who had read the Bill would see that it was one to enable certain certificates to be issued to a person who wanted to be married abroad, and who must use those certificates to show that there was no lawful impediment in this country to such a marriage taking place. He did not like the system of granting those certificates, because they must often be obtained under circumstances under which they ought not to be issued, and they were liable to a certain amount of abuse by persons who might not be entitled to receive such certificates, and in that way they might be used for bringing about a marriage which ought not to take place. His other Amendment was intended to prevent those certificates making valid any marriage which otherwise would be invalid. They ought to see that it was clearly provided that the granting of any such certificates would not validate a marriage abroad which would otherwise be invalid in this country.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, after the word 'may,' to add the words 'if the law in such foreign countries requires the production of any such certificates as is hereinafter mentioned.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland) said the first clause was really essential in order to fill a gap that existed in the present marriage law. Most foreign countries required the production of certain certificates to show that according to English law a marriage celebrated abroad would not be invalid. At the present time there was no machinery by which those certificates might be given and no officer was empowered to grant them. The Home Office was continually being asked by Englishmen who wished to marry foreigners to provide them with certificates, and the only thing they could do was to procure a statement from some respectable person whose signature could be verified by the Home Office, and this under some protest was generally accepted by the German or other Governments. There was far more opportunity for fraud under the present practice than there would be under the scheme proposed by this Bill. The German Government had pressed them to establish some system by which British subjects in Germany could conform with the German law, and the Foreign Office had undertaken to promote legislation of this kind to fulfil this very reasonable demand on the part of the foreign countries. He thought England was the only country that did not make such provision, and that was the reason for the introduction of this clause of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had suggested words to make this clause applicable only if required by the law of a foreign country, but that was the intention of the Bill, which was not mandatory but permissive. He agreed that it was desirable on the face of an Act of Parliament to state its purpose, and he saw no objection to the insertion of those words. It was always a very dangerous thing, however, without notice to accept another form of words than that which had been decided upon by those who had prepared the Bill. With regard to the second point raised by the right hon. Gentleman, what had been referred to was a necessary condition to a marriage being solemnised in the country in which it took place. Anything done here could not of itself either validate or invalidate any marriage under the law of Germany. He would gladly consider the point which had been raised in order to see whether any such Amendment was necessary. This Bill was prepared under the late Government by the Home Office and the Foreign Office, and in the last Parliament it was brought in by a private Member with the cordial approval of the late Government and especially of Lord Cranborne. He was sure hon. Gentlemen would use their best endeavours to secure its passage into law.

SIR E. CARSON said he was satisfied with the reply which had been given, and he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clauses 1 to 7 agreed to.

On the schedule.

*LORD TURNOUR called attention to Paragraph (a) of sub-section 2 which provided for an oath "that the applicant believes that there is no impediment to the marriage by reason of kindred or alliance." Why was that provision necessary since in any case by the law the marriage could not take place if the parties came under the affinity table? Then there was sub-section (b) of the same clause requiring an oath to be subscribed "that the applicant has for three weeks immediately preceding had his usual residence within the district of the registrar or officer." That also seemed to him to be unnecessary. Would it not be possible to omit both those sub-sections?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said it was perfectly clear that if there was any impediment the marriage could not take place. The schedule must contain those things which would prevent the marriage taking place. It was obvious that there should be some period of residence in order that the registrar should have some knowledge of the parties. This provision precisely repeated the words of the Marriage with Foreigners Act which dealt with marriages between British subjects and foreigners according to British law.

LORD TURNOUR said he did not see how the registrar could get any knowledge of the parties from a three weeks residence.

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked if the hon. Member in charge of the Bill thought because the parties lived in his district three weeks the Registrar would know them.

SIR E. CARSON said it was very likely that a person might remain in a district three weeks without being known at all.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said there was a later clause which required that notice should be given and posted for at least three weeks. There must be some locality the registrar or marriage officer of which should issue the necessary certificates, and the natural locality to take was that in which the parties had been recently residing.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment read a third time; and passed.

SIR E. CARSON appealed to the Patronage Secretary to consent to the adjournment. They had got through a good deal of business and it was now two o'clock. The Opposition had facilitated the business in every way and they had offered no opposition to Second Readings being taken.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said he hoped the Opposition would consent to the Extradition Bill and the Revenue Resolution.

EXTRADITION BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked the Minister in charge of the measure to define "bribery" within the meaning of the Bill. He understood from the statement made on the Second Reading that the object of the Bill was to enable persons charged with bribery in the United States to be taken back to that country. He wanted to know whether the definition of bribery under the law of the United States was the same as under the law of the United Kingdom.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said that this Bill had regard to bribery as determined by British law.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked what circumstances had given rise to the necessity for the Bill.

SIR E. CARSON said he held the office of Solicitor-General when the negotiations with Mr. Choate, the American Ambassador, in regard to this Bill took place. The American Government thought that bribery should be an extradictable offence. Many flagrant cases had arisen, and this measure was needed if the United States Government were to be enabled to bring the offenders to justice.

LORD BALCARRES said he did not think this complicated question should be proceeded with without legal advice from the law officers of the Crown, and without a definition of the term "bribery." Why was not a definition clause put in the Bill? The Bill contained no attempt at a definition of the term, and it did not say who was to interpret what was meant by it.

MR. T. M. HEALY said there was considerable difficulty in saying what bribery really was. They should have the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown before passing the clause. He really thought this was a case in which they ought to consult Mr. Justice Grantham.

LORD TURNOUR said they ought to have a clear definition of the meaning to be attached to the word "bribery." Having regard to the fact that no Law Officer of the Crown was present, and that it was now ten minutes past two o'clock he begged to move that progress be reported.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think I can accept that Motion. I understood it was agreed that the Committee Stage of this Bill should be taken.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said it would be too voluminous to attempt to give an elaborate definition of twenty or thirty crimes in a clause in a Bill of this character. All extradition crimes were declared in the schedule to the Extradition Act, 1870, to be definable according to the law in force dealing with those crimes.

MR. CLAUDE HAY moved to report progress; but the Motion was not accepted by the Chairman.

MR. MORTON said he did not know what "bribery" meant. Would it be bribery if a gentleman asked another to dinner?

Question, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill," put and agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time and passed without Amendment.

REVENUE [EXCISE DUTY, &c.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That there be charged, as from the sixth day of July, nineteen hundred and six, on a licence to be taken out annually by a manufacturer for sale of British wines, an excise duty of one pound.

Lord Turnour.

2. Resolved, that a uniform duty of ten shillings be substituted for the stamp duties now chargeable on an Award in England or Ireland, and on an Award or Decreet Arbitral in Scotland.

3. Resolved, That it is expedient that the amount payable out of the Consolidated Fund under section three of The Bank Act, 1892, shall, as regards Treasury Bills, be at the rate of two hundred pounds for every million pounds of the maximum amount of Bills outstanding at any one time during the financial year, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other purposes connected with Finance.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE 1904-5.

Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon Navy and Army Grants for 1904–5, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to the Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year—(*Mr. McKenna*)—upon Monday next.

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented on the 19th day of February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July.

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 20*th July*, 1906.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:

1. Indian Railways Act Amendment.

2. Education of Defective Children (Scotland).

3. Reserve Forces.

4. Municipal Corporations.

5. Wireless Telegraphy.

6. Forfar Corporation Water Order Confirmation.

7. Land Drainage Provisional Order.

8. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1).

9. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2).

10. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).

11. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4).

12. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5).

13. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6).

14. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7).

15. Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law).

16. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2).

17. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3).

18. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5).

19. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6).

20. Sea Fisheries Provisional Order.

21. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1).

22. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2).

23. Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3).

24. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, &c.).

25. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, &c.).

26. Maryport Harbour.

27. Southampton Gas.

28. Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions).

29. Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways.

30. Channel Ferry Railway and Quay.

31. Hull Joint Dock.

32. Crellin's Patents.

33. Rugby Lower School.

34. Haslingden Corporation.

35. North and South Shields Electric Railway.

36. Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting).

37. Barry Railway.

38. Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool Gas.

39. Cambrian Railways.

40. Metropolitan District Railway.

41. Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies.

42. Trent Navigation Company.

43. Merthyr Tydfil Gas.

44. Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway.

45. Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways.

46. Clacton Urban District Council.

47. Newport Harbour Commissioners.

48. Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund).

49. Sheffield District Railway.

50. Kettering Water.

51. Bury Corporation.

52. South Suburban Gas.

53. Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels).

54. Manchester Churches.

55. Penllwyn Railway and Road.

56. Metropolitan Railway.

57. Dover Corporation.

58. London and North Western Railway.

59. Dowlais Gas.

60. Epsom and Ewell Gas.

61. Waterford Corporation and Bridge.

62. Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

63. Newtownards Urban District Council.

64. Midland Railway.

65. Uxbridge Gas.

66. Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway.

67. Scottish Union and National Insurance Company.

68. Cheltenham Gas.

69. Huddersfield Corporation.

70. London and South Western Railway.

71. London County Buildings.

72. Metropolitan Water Board.

73. North East London Railway.

74. Peterborough Gas.

75. Cardiff Gas.

76. Manchester Corporation.

77. Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas.

78. Folkestone and District Electricity Supply.

79. Glamorgan and South Wales Water.

80. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway.

81. Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage.

82. Newport Corporation.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. Reported with Amendments.

North West London Railway Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Bristol Corporation Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Northern Railway Bill; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill. Read 3ª, and passed.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill; Bacup Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill. Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 169.)

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; London Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Lyveden be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Castlemaine; read, and agreed to.

PETITIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Petition for extension of franchise to coloured British Subjects in South Africa; of members of the African Political Organisation signing. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3675, Japan: Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Orders made by the following borough councils, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the respective boroughs: Wigan; Stockton-on-Tees; Royal Leamington Spa.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

OPEN SPACES BILL (NO. 167).

MARRIAGE WITH FOREIGNERS BILL (NO 168).

Brought from the Commons, read 1^a, and to be printed.

EXTRADITION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

GROUND GAME BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order); and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

THE EDUCATION BILL.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I have had the advantage of some private communications with the noble Marquess who leads the House as to the date at which the Second Reading of the Education Bill might be taken. I think it would be for the general convenience of your Lordships if the noble Marquess could state what he proposes.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, I understand that the Education Bill will be read a third time in the House of Commons on Monday the 30th, and it is proposed that a few Members of your Lordships' House should sit late to receive the Bill that night. It will be remembered that this course was adopted in 1902 in regard to the Education Bill of that year. The Bill will then be read a first time, and I propose that it should be put down for Second Reading on Wednesday, August 1st. So far as I understand, it is likely that the debate on the Second Reading will terminate on Friday, August 3rd, and that this House will be able to adjourn then. What the Government hope is that both Houses will adjourn on that day to Tuesday, October 23rd.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I understand that the Bill as reprinted is likely to be in your Lordships' hands on the Tuesday.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I am so advised. But having had some experience in these matters I decline to take any personal responsibility. I am, however, doing everything in my power in this direction, and I have every reason to believe that the Bill will be in your Lordships' hands on Tuesday.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON NO. 1) BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day read for the consideration of the Commons Amendments.

***THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE)**: My Lords, these Amendments are of a purely formal character, and they are approved by the Department. Their effect is, in the case of certain parts of a property being taken under the Lands Clauses Act instead of the whole, to bring the wording of the clause in the Bill into conformity with the model clause which is generally used in such cases. I therefore trust your Lordships will agree to the Amendments.

Moved, "That the Commons Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Earl of Crewe*).

On Question, Motion agreed to.

MOTOR OMNIBUSES.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether their attention has been called to the correspondence which has recently appeared in the newspapers between the Kensington Borough Council, Sir Theodore Martin, and the Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, on the subject of the noise, annoyance, and injury caused by motor omnibuses in various parts of London; and what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take in the interests of the inhabitants of London to mitigate the dangerous nuisance caused by motor omnibuses and other mechanically-propelled vehicles.

I hope it will not be thought that in bringing this subject before the notice of your Lordships I am actuated by any undue dislike of motor vehicles, or that the question itself is superfluous on the present occasion. Although it is perfectly true that a great many questions of a similar nature have been asked recently in another place, it is equally true that the best way of calling attention to any subject such as this, which I believe is of real importance to the comfort and convenience of the citizens of London, is by what is commonly called "hammering" at it and reiterating the main points. That must be my excuse for troubling your Lordships on the present occasion.

The whole question of the street government of London is extremely complex and difficult, and, as a matter of fact, there is no central authority in a position to deal with the subject. Whether you consider what is going on underground or the traffic on the streets it is quite certain that whatever authority exists at the present moment is so divided and so uncertain that, with the exception of the very restricted powers that the Metropolitan Police possess, there is no real control over street traffic in the Metropolis. As your Lordships have doubtless noticed, the columns of the public Press within the last ten days have revealed a strong movement of public feeling with regard to the general management and control of the working of motor omnibuses and similar public vehicles in London, and I have received several remarkable communications from persons whose property and whose health have been affected by the unduly and unnecessarily careless method of handling motor omnibuses.

The first complaint made in respect of what I am justified in calling the dangerous nuisance created by these vehicles refers to their noise. We all know that it is impossible to run a heavy vehicle over any class of paving without creating a certain amount of noise, but these ponderous vehicles, which weigh between four and seven tons, not only create the amount of din incidental to such heavy traffic, but, in addition to this, their passage through the streets is characterised by a most extraordinary series of noises, apparently peculiar to each class of motor omnibus. Some groan, others whine, others emit one prolonged wail which can be heard for hundreds of yards, and whenever there is a change of gear there is an extraordinary accentuation of these sounds wonderful to hear.

I ask your Lordships to consider the effect of this excess of noise—for I am quite certain it *is* excessive—upon the nerves and general health of a large proportion of the population of London. Many people have to work in the houses; and if these residences happen to be on one of the main routes of the omnibuses, it becomes almost impossible to work in any kind of comfort or with any kind of mental peace owing to their noise as well as their vibration. Windows have to be closed, otherwise conversation is impossible. If the nuisance is not abated by legislation or otherwise the hospitals and other great public institutions must be dangerously affected. Take, for instance, the Hospital for Epilepsy and Paralysis. Motor omnibuses, hooting, vibrating, and making most horrible din, pass this hospital 700 times a day. Take, again, Charing Cross Hospital or St. George's Hospital, both of which are situated on the lines of route of these omnibuses. I ask your Lordships to consider what the effect on the nerves of the patients must be of the constant passing of such vehicles, often from six o'clock in the morning till two o'clock the following morning.

The second ground of complaint with regard to the health of the citizen of

London is the horrible smell which many of these omnibuses emit and surround themselves with. I have reason to believe that there are many devotees of the motor who are so enamoured of the industry that they really like this peculiar smell. I know there is one noble Lord in this House, who is going to speak in this discussion, who is so devoted to all motor vehicles that it is impossible for him, I believe, not to be almost favourably disposed towards this particular kind of odour. But however agreeable to the senses of some the smell of petrol used in excess may be, it is certainly unattractive to the vast majority of persons; and, furthermore, it is open to doubt whether the smell which is persistently being given off by these vehicles in the London streets is not deleterious to the public health. At any rate, we have had the views of eminent chemists upon this, although I am bound to say we cannot always afford to consider too favourably the opinions of medical and other experts on this sort of matter. Your Lordships are well aware that almost every article of food which we consume has been condemned at some time or another during the last few years by experts, and if we listened to these gentlemen we should indeed lead a simple life, for we should neither eat nor drink.

The smell from motor omnibuses, added to the dust which they raise, has much to do with the losses of owners of houses in the streets through which these omnibuses pass. A thick blue haze hangs round many motor omnibuses. This, added to the oil drippings and mephitic vapours, leads to a condition of the streets which cannot be contemplated with satisfaction. The third ground of complaint is the method of handling these omnibuses, by which there has been considerable injury to property and even loss of life. I have no doubt your Lordships have read the recent correspondence between the Kensington Borough Council, Sir Theodore Martin, and the Chief Commissioner of Police on which I have ventured to base my Question, and you have seen from that evidence the amount of harm which is being done to private property in that part of town by the constant vibration caused by these vehicles. I do not think it requires much intelligence to see that the question of rates over a very considerable portion of inhabited London will become a still more pressing one in the future.

I have received correspondence from persons who say they are absolutely unable to live in the houses which they have taken and furnished and from which they are now compelled to move; and in some instances the persistent vibration, noise, and discomfort caused by the running of motor omnibuses have done most serious harm to the health of the inhabitants of those houses. I am not aware myself how far the underground arrangements of London have been disturbed or injured by the immense weight of the motor omnibuses now plying on our streets, but I cannot think that the road-ways of the Metropolis have been constructed sufficiently strongly to bear for any length of time such heavy traffic without great injury being done to the pipes, of which there is a regular network, underneath. I see that one company announces that within the next few months they are going to put on the streets another 100 motor omnibuses. This will seriously increase the danger of damage being done to the pipes to which I have referred, and which constitute most essential adjuncts to life in London. As I have said, there is no central authority which can really deal with these matters. We all know that there has been a Traffic Commission and a Motor Commission, and I believe a Select Committee of the House of Commons is now sitting on the whole question of public carriages. I do not know what your Lordships' experience may be in these matters, but I confess that I always have grave doubts of any very satisfactory legislative results coming from the findings of any Royal Commission. My impression is that such bodies are generally appointed for the purpose of postponing difficult questions. If we are to wait for legislation founded on the Reports of these Commissions or Committees I doubt whether we shall ever get very much more forward in these matters. The Commissioner of Police has some restrictive powers by which he can deal with public vehicles, though not with private ones, and I do blame him a little for the attitude he has taken up. He says that this being a young and growing industry he therefore does not wish to take notice of evils which undoubtedly exist until that industry has, so to speak, "found its legs." Surely it is unwise to let the industry develop without at least hinting to these companies that there are certain things which they ought to improve in the interests of the general public. Would it not have been better if the police had given a gentle hint to these companies that they were going beyond the limits to which they were entitled? I am of opinion that that would have led to their taking more precautions with respect to the running of these vehicles.

I think it would be an excellent thing if His Majesty's Government would now take in hand this matter of the control of the London streets, especially with regard to these heavy motor omnibuses, and that the Local Government Board and the Home Office, as representing the police, should come to some agreement as to the regulations which might be imposed. I think there might also be a special police department under an expert to watch the working of motor traffic within the metropolitan district. With regard to the other mechanically-propelled vehicles referred to in my Question, I wish particularly to refer to the large traction engines which are permitted to traverse the streets dragging behind them what amounts to a miniature train. These traction engines are a grave danger to public comfort and very often to life, and constitute an intolerable nuisance. They frequently pass not far from my house. They emit volumes of smoke and sparks of fire, and the trucks they drag take up as much room as two long omnibuses joined together. They frighten every horse within reasonable distance, and when they come to a hill they generally stop and make the most extraordinary noise it is possible to conceive.

These traction engines are most offensive both to man and beast, and in the interest of public safety some steps should be taken by the Local Government Board to look into this matter. If possible the owners of these engines should be compelled to discontinue their use and substitute less outwardly offensive machines. I will not detain your Lordships longer, but I do believe that if His Majesty's Government would take some steps to regulate the heavy traffic to which I have referred, and which renders life extremely dangerous and unpleasant to a very large proportion of the citizens of London, they would do much to make themselves popular in this somewhat eccentrically-regulated Metropolis.

*LORD TEYNHAM: My Lords, the noble Marquess has produced arguments to show that various motor vehicles, and especially motor omnibuses, are a nuisance to the public. I have no doubt this is true, but, at the same time, all vehicles are more or less a nuisance, not only to pedestrians and householders, but to themselves. Your Lordships are familiar with the motorist who is angry with the driver of the cart in front of him because it is going too slow; with the cart driver who stares at the motorist because he has to make way for him; and also with the annoyed pedestrian who has to get out of the way of both.

Motor vehicles are also condemned because they make a noise, but we are told on good authority that these noises in future will to a large extent be avoided. From one point of view, I submit that the motor 'bus has an advantage over one other kind of vehicle—namely, the motor brougham, because it makes a noise which enables pedestrians to know it is coming, whereas the motor brougham is dangerous from its very silence. I think it ought also to be remembered in favour of the motor omnibus that its existence puts in the background any malevolent schemes of the London County Council to run tramcars through our streets at the public expense. I do not think London could have any worse fate than that. Again, all lovers of horses must be glad to see that the day is coming when we shall no longer witness the pitiful distress of horses dragging heavy loads of passengers on 'buses in hot weather and falling about the streets in wet weather.

I do not deny that the motor omnibus is a noisy and often a smelly vehicle, and is sometimes badly driven, but I hope His Majesty's Government, when considering these points, will bear in mind that it has been of enormous benefit to the public in having solved the problem of cheap and rapid transit for those who have no private vehicle of their own. I think that any act on the part of the Government which would put any check on the present use or the future development of the motor omnibus would be nothing short of a calamity for those who use it. It is estimated that at the present time no fewer than 2,000,000 people are carried on motor omnibuses in one week. The popularity of motor 'buses is evidenced by their crowded state as compared to the emptiness of the old horse 'buses; and I think that any undue interference on the part of the Government would be a real hardship to the middle and working classes of London and its suburbs.

*LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the noble Marquess who introduced this subject, and I must say I think he somewhat exaggerated the case against the motor omnibus. We all know that the motor omnibus is not perfect and that a great many of the allegations made against this form of locomotion were brought against every other form in its initial stages. If one looks back at the daily Press of 1825–40 one sees criticism of the locomotion of those days framed in not even such courteous language as that adopted by the noble Marquess in his references to motor omnibuses. It was prophesied at that time that men and animals would suffer and die from the noise, the smell, and the shaking of the engines which were then introduced for the first time. I observed that the noble Marquess to-day used an adjective which frequently cropped up in the literature of those days—they talked continually of mephitic vapours.

Now, of what does the public in general complain? I think the public complains of four things—namely, the noise, the smell, the speed, and the dust; but I think I shall be able to show your Lordships that all these defects, the complaints about which are perfectly legitimate, are in process of being remedied. I will first deal with noise. This proceeds, as a rule, from bad driving, which injures the gears of the vehicles and renders them more noisy. This can be and is being remedied every day in two ways—first, by the more constant replacing of the damaged parts; and, secondly, by the substitution of improved forms of gearing. As regards the noise made by a faulty arrangement in the exhaust, this defect is also being remedied; and I am glad to be able to say, on behalf of the English vehicle as against the foreign vehicle, that most of the former are nearly blameless in this respect; it is mainly the German vehicles which are causing the trouble at the present moment. I do not mean to say that there are no good foreign-made omnibuses, but, as a matter of fact, the noise proceeds in the majority of cases from foreign-made omnibuses. Then the noble Marquess referred to the speed at which these vehicles travel.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY: I said very little about that.

*LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: I understood the noble Marquess to say that they were dangerous to public safety in the streets. I agree that many of these omnibuses do travel at a great speed and that racing is at times indulged in, involving a certain amount of danger. As far as my observation, however, goes—and I am a constant traveller on motor omnibuses—it is not as a rule the drivers, but the passengers who are anxious to go fast. If a motor omnibus which is being driven at the legal speed is overtaken by another, one hears such remarks as "Go on, Bill, do you want to be left behind?" addressed to the driver. It is the desire of the passengers to get to their destination as quickly as possible, and the drivers in many cases incur a good deal of abuse if they do not drive the omnibus at a high speed. This desire for speed is evident in many other directions, and when some of the authorities seem to be frightened of an extra mile or two an hour they should not forget that members of the general public as a rule, whether travelling by steamships, in railway trains, or in omnibuses, do not like to be passed by others travelling faster. That tendency is inherent in human nature, and you cannot get over it.

I come now to the dust question. Dust is a great nuisance in the country—in fact, it is the root of all the evil as regards automobilism in the country, but it is less of a nuisance in London. London dust consists of something like 90 per cent. of dried horse manure, which, from an analysis I had taken last year, I am assured is a most favourable breeding ground for bacteria, the bacilli of nearly every common disease being found therein. As soon as we get a nearly horseless London much of the so-called dust will have disappeared. As regards London, therefore, I do not regard the dust problem as a permanent one. It will solve itself when fewer horses and more motor vehicles are on the streets, and then we shall have a nearly dustless London. With regard to over-lubrication, which causes the giving off of that "horrible blue smoke" to which the noble Marquess referred, that defect is quickly being remedied. It is possible now to have an excellent and powerful machine with automatic oiling, which prevents any possibility of the emission of blue smoke behind the vehicle. The Pioneer Omnibus Company—an English company—have adopted this arrangement, and in consequence not one of their green 'buses emits this smoke.

We were all sorry to hear that Sir Theodore Martin had been compelled to leave his house in London and go to the country owing to the noise of these vehicles. I can claim to have had more experience of the noise of motors than most people. I sleep over the Strand and I work in Piccadilly Circus, and the combination of noises in these two places gives me a certain authority to speak as to the noise of motor omnibuses. In the Strand they run up till all times in the morning, and I cannot say their noise is pleasant. But I maintain that these are disadvantages inseparable from main arteries of traffic in great cities. I have no doubt whatever that the traffic in Park Lane, in Piccadilly, and in other main thoroughfares all over London has enormously increased during the past ten years, and I venture to think that it must inevitably still further increase in the future. I think the rich will find in future that it is desirable to take up their residence in the seclusion of a *cul de sac* or in places not used by through traffic. I am willing, however, to acknowledge that something must be done, and I am sure that something will be done to stop excessive noise. Besides the more frequent repairing of gears and the tightening up of chains, springs, and so on, which is being done now in some cases twice a day by the motor omnibus companies, there are many new devices being brought out which will tend to quieter running. I have seen within the last two days designs of improvements in solid tyres which will have a great effect in lessening noise and vibration. It is not my business to defend His Majesty's Government, who can well take care of themselves, but I do not see what more the Government can do than has been done by the late Administration and by His Majesty's present Ministry. Motor omnibuses only began to run in the streets in May, 1904, and it was not until March, 1905, or a little more than a year ago, that they began to run in any number.

I have this morning received statistics of the number of motor omnibuses in the streets and their probable number in the future. At present there are about 560 motor omnibuses running, and there are 800 or 900 more on order. By this time next year we may look forward to there being something like 1,200 or 1,500 motor omnibuses in the streets of London. Several of the big companies have decided to replace the whole of their horse-propelled vehicles by mechanical power. The General Omnibus Company have 300 motor omnibuses on order, the London Road Car Company have 200 on order, and the Vanguard Company 200 on order, and in the course of five years a horse-drawn 'bus will be quite a rarity in the London streets. I agree with the noble Marquess that the companies must put their house in order. It is inevitable that motor omnibuses should replace horse-drawn omnibuses; they earn per day a good deal more than double that of horse-drawn 'buses; and in a journey such as that from Putney to the City they gain from twenty to twenty-five minutes each way in time, which is a very important consideration to the

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu.

clerk and artisan. When you take into consideration that on a return journey such as this between forty and fifty minutes are saved you can at once understand how popular motor omnibuses will become among the travelling public.

Statistics taken on two or three days last week show that between 380,000 and 400,000 passengers a day were carried by these vehicles, so that there is a considerable democratic backing behind them. There is no doubt whatever that they are becoming more popular every day, and as far as we can see they are going to be the means in the future of solving the housing problem and of making it possible for those who work to live much further from the centres of industry than is possible at the present time. These are points which should not be overlooked in considering this matter.

I do not know whether your Lordships are acquainted with the manner in which these omnibuses are licensed at the present moment. The process is as follows. First of all the new motor 'bus is taken to the carriage police officer of the district, who measures the seating, its height from the ground, and the width of the axles. He then tries the brakes and submits the 'bus to other minor tests, and then stamps it and puts the crown plate on with the number. Then comes the process of licensing the driver, which, to my mind, is not so effective as it might be, and should be improved. The driver comes down with his 'bus to New Scotland Yard. He is then told to reverse his gear to a certain point near the pavement, he then goes forward a little and back a little, and having been tested as to whether he can reverse his gear and bring the 'bus alongside the pavement he is next ordered out among the traffic, where he takes the inspector, who probably knows much less of the mechanical working of the 'bus than the driver, for a short drive along the streets. A quarter of an hour or twenty minutes is all that this hard-worked official can give to the process of finding out whether or not the man can drive.

Some more technical knowledge is desirable on the part of the licensing inspector. The other day a driver was cast for taking a course in driving which we all adopt who try to drive our motor cars properly. It is not to be expected that the police should be acquainted with the proper system of driving motor vehicles, and I think they are adopting probably the best course in getting their men to attend the polytechnics and learn something about this matter. Some of the inspectors have in this way, and by mixing with the motor fraternity generally, acquired no little technical knowledge. Having passed the driver for the road the police have nothing more to do with the vehicle unless it should happen that the driver is summoned for furious driving.

One of the best of the companies are trying to tackle this question of bad driving. It is their practice to make every man who goes to them to learn to drive deposit £5, and he is then put through a course of training at their works in driving and in mechanical work connected with the machinery. The result is that these particular 'buses are driven much better than the others, to the great advantage of the public. Motor omnibus drivers are paid a comparatively high wage. They earn 6s. 8d. or 6s. 9d. per day of nine hours. The drivers of horse-drawn omnibuses are paid more or less the same wage, but have to work twelve hours a day. It is hoped that the wages of motor omnibus drivers, which range from £2 to £2 10s. a week, will, in course of time, attract good men as drivers. The question of the inspection of these omnibuses to secure the safety of the public has been brought prominently to public notice through the Handcross Hill accident, which was due, in my mind, to the driver not using his hand brake. The companies however are examining their 'buses twice a day, and this is a great safeguard against accidents.

I think the noble Marquess, in opening this debate, was very fair on the whole, considering that he voices the undoubted complaints of many frontagers and people who are disturbed by the passage of these omnibuses; but I would like to point out that if there is not a certain amount of toleration for the imperfections to be expected in a new industry, improvements in the vehicles cannot be hoped for.

The early railways were imperfect, the early steamboats were imperfect, and nothing can, in my opinion, produce a perfect motor omnibus except regular working and practical experience. Improvements are constantly being made, and I hope that His Majesty's Government will not place unreasonable restrictions in the way of the development of this great industry, which is undoubtedly a boon to a considerable number of Londoners. It will enable the workers in London to live at a greater distance from their workshops, to obtain better air and pay cheaper rents, and although it will redistribute to some extent values in land and property, it will bring general benefit to the community.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH : My Lords, it appears to be generally admitted that the chief objection to the motor omnibus is the noise that it makes, and it is thought desirable to employ expert policemen to arrest the drivers of motor omnibuses and steam traction engines which make too much noise. But there are very few people whose hearing is exactly alike, and if a policeman with a delicate ear arrested a motor 'bus driver on this ground he might, when before the magistrate, be confronted with a half-deaf man who would declare that the machine merely made a pleasant hum which promoted sleep. I would therefore suggest that scientific men should be consulted to see if it is not possible to invent some instrument for accurately measuring sound.

EARL BEAUCHAMP : My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will agree that we have had an interesting debate on this subject. The attack which was made by the noble Marquess has been met by two other noble Lords, and therefore it is not necessary for me to say anything except to answer the Question. The attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to the correspondence referred to, but they are not prepared to say anything on its merits, and for this reason, that at the present time there are two bodies engaged in considering the whole subject. One of them is the Royal Commission on Motor Cars, and their recommendations, I understand, will be circulated very shortly. The other body is the Select Committee of the House of Commons who are going into the whole question of cab and omnibus regulations and the traffic of London generally. I understand that the Reports will contain useful information, and His Majesty's Government anticipate that they will be of great value to them when they come to deal with this question. It is proposed, therefore, to consider both of these Reports before taking any steps in the matter; and it is not contemplated in the meantime to do anything more than allow chief constables to take such steps as they may think fit in the various areas. I may perhaps suggest to the noble Marquess that this delay will have its value. As the noble Lord opposite (Lord Montagu of Beaulieu) said, there are constant improvements being effected, and perhaps some of the keenest brains in this country are at the present time engaged in perfecting this new industry. I can assure the noble Marquess that his suggestions will receive the attention of the Home Office. The noble Marquess seemed to lack one qualification in speaking of motor omnibuses, because he did not tell us whether he was himself a frequent passenger on those vehicles.

*THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY : I get on them as often as they will allow me, but they never stop for a passenger, and unless a man is an athlete it is difficult to board them.

EARL BEAUCHAMP : I can assure my noble friend, from daily experience, that they are an exceedingly comfortable and convenient mode of travelling, and I hope that in future when the noble Marquess tries to get on a motor 'bus the conductor will be good enough to stop for him.

*EARL CAWDOR : My Lords, we are all agreed, so far as the motor omnibus is concerned, that it is a great convenience, but the complaint is that the comfort and convenience of passengers is being provided at the expense of annoyance to the general community. I quite agree that it is reasonable to allow time for improvements and to wait for the Reports of the Commission and the Committee, but I venture to express the hope that His Majesty's Government will not forget one inquiry on which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack sat—I mean the Royal Commission on London Traffic. I trust that action will be taken when these bodies have reported to bring into force some part, at any rate, of the recommendations of that Royal Commission. We all listened with very great interest to the speech of Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, who is a great authority on this subject, and I am sure we were all glad to learn from him that in the early future we may hope that the nuisance now caused by the noise, smoke, and smell of the motor 'bus will disappear. I hope His Majesty's Government will put some slight pressure on those who are bringing out these vehicles in order that the public may as soon as possible derive the benefit from the improvements which are invented. The noble Lord behind me (Lord Montagu of Beaulieu) seemed to be of opinion that motor omnibuses only ran through main thoroughfares, and he suggested we should all live in a *cul de sac.* I am afraid that would be rather difficult. But I would venture to call attention to the fact that this traffic is by no means confined to main thoroughfares. Places like Onslow Square can hardly be considered main thoroughfares, and yet motor 'buses without end run through it. There is at present no power under which the local authority or the police can discriminate between the class of traffic that may be allowed to pass down a certain thoroughfare. That is a very great evil, and one which ought to be remedied. It is one of the points I would press on the attention of His Majesty's Government in dealing with the recommendations of the Traffic Commission. I hope His Majesty's Government will give the matter that prompt consideration which it certainly deserves.

EMPLOYMENT OF EX-SEAMEN.

LORD MUSKERRY rose to call attention to certain appointments in Government Departments and other places under the control of the Government which are open to ex-seamen and ex-soldiers who have served in the Navy and Army respectively, and to urge the desirability and importance, from a national point of view and as a matter of justice, that these appointments should be open to men who could show long and creditable service in the merchant service equally with men who have served in the Navy and Army, and who are already in receipt of Government pensions.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, in calling attention to this subject I am not going to comment at any length upon the very excellent scheme of appointing ex-seamen and ex-soldiers to fill certain posts in different Departments which are under the control of the Government in England, Scotland, and Ireland. For instance, I understand from the latest Return that, to take the Post Office, 5,476 ex-soldiers and 427 ex-seamen were filling established appointments, while 1,201 ex-soldiers and 396 ex-seamen were filling unestablished situations in that Department alone. The total number of appointments of all kinds made in one year was, to the clerical force, 1,500, and, as postmen, porters, etc., 2,811.

In the light of the few additional remarks I propose to offer I trust your Lordships will attach special significance to a note appended to the last Return to the effect that ex-seamen or ex-soldier candidates could not be obtained for all the vacancies which fell due to be filled by them. We must always remember that though the merchant service is composed of a number of constituent parts which are managed and controlled by individuals, it is, nevertheless, the greatest national service we have. Without it our country would be starving in six weeks time, and without it we could have made a very poor show, not only in the South African War, but also in other wars. The naval manœuvres of this year afford striking proof of what the Government themselves think of the importance of our merchant ships in time of war, but, as your Lordships are well aware, there are evils existing in connection with the manning of the merchant service which are a standing disgrace, and, I would also say, a standing menace to our country.

We are continually lamenting the gradual loss of the British sailor and the reluctance of British boys to go to sea.

Some people profess that they are unable to understand it, but it is the easiest thing imaginable to arrive at the true reasons for this regrettable state of affairs. It is that the merchant service holds out no inducements for a decent and respectable boy or man to go to sea. He has a hard life, full of dangers and risks, quite apart from serious and often enough ever-present discomfort. He has no guarantee of continuous service; he has fourteen hours of work a day, Saturdays and Sundays included; and if he starts at sea aspiring to become an officer and a captain he knows that these grievances will ultimately be supplemented by many others. When he starts his career at sea he gets little, if any, pay, and when he is a full-fledged able seaman he is not much better off, considering the number of hours he has to work and the want of continuous employment.

Our British merchant seaman has no possible chance of making provision for old age, whereas our seamen in the Royal Navy and our soldiers are in a much more favourable position, for they are in receipt of pensions, small though they may be, after a certain number of years service. As I say, our merchant seamen are much worse off, and yet they receive far less consideration at the hands of the Government. They have nothing to look forward to in old age but the workhouse, and often enough our merchant captains and officers who lose their positions through no fault of their own are treated as derelicts of their profession if they are anything on the wrong side of forty years of age.

I have been urged by the Merchant Service Guild, which is the biggest representative body of its kind in the world, to bring this matter to the notice of your Lordships' House. It would be a source of immense benefit not only to our merchant seamen, but to the merchant service as a whole, were the Government to extend the present system of filling official positions at their disposal in the direction of throwing them open to men of the merchant service who are able to show long and creditable records in following their profession. The Government would be perfectly justified in so doing, for the merchant service is of great national importance. Such action on their part would constitute an inducement to enter the merchant service, and it would be an incentive to men to be of good character whilst there. Having regard to the great amount of insubordination which now exists in the mercantile marine, this latter point is a most important one.

I do not see what objection the Government can offer to taking a step such as I am now advocating, particularly so as it seems that ex-Royal Naval seamen or ex-soldier candidates have not been available for all the vacancies as they fell due. I understand that this matter was brought to the notice of the late Prime Minister by the Merchant Service Guild. The right hon. Gentleman promised to consider it, but, as he went out of office shortly afterwards, nothing practical has ensued. I trust, therefore, that the present Government will be able to give their favourable consideration to this important matter.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, the noble Lord has always taken the greatest interest in the merchant service, and is, as we all know, a champion of the interests of the men who do such good service in the mercantile marine and who are such valuable citizens of our country. But, my Lords, I think that he is going a little too far in asking that this special privilege should be given to one class of the civil population.

I should like to remind your Lordships of what has taken place with regard to the giving of preference to ex-members of the two defence services. There have been, I think, three Committees of recent years—the Committees of 1875 and 1895, and the Committee which has just reported on the subject—and each one has in strong terms recommended that in all public offices and departments, whether Governmental or local, preference should be given to men from the two services in the distribution of this sort of employment. Those recommendations which, as the noble Lord has said, have been very largely given effect to have not been altogether accepted with satisfaction by the civil population, some of whom think it is unfair that they should be shut out by this preference. While sympathising with that feeling, I at the same time most strongly approve of the recommendations of the Committees and of the course that has been taken by the public Departments in this matter.

It must be remembered that soldiers and sailors have very special duties and make very special sacrifices. They risk their lives and their health in the service of the country; they submit themselves to discipline and deprive themselves of a great deal of liberty of action. Those sacrifices are, I think, rightly recognised by the Departments and by public bodies. I am, therefore, strongly in favour of the system that has been adopted; but to propose to extend that particular privilege to one class of the civil population, however excellent, does seem to me to be rather a strong order. The practice varies in the different Departments, but on the whole the report that I have received does not agree with the statement of the noble Lord. It shows on the other hand that the Departments have not had sufficient places to comply with all the applications coming from ex-seamen and ex-soldiers.

Besides the sacrifices these men make, it must be remembered that it does happen, perhaps more in the Army than in the Navy, that men are discharged at a time when it is extremely difficult for them to get ordinary employment in civil life. This is an additional reason for extending to them the privileges and facilities which are now given. Those privileges and facilities are being largely extended, I am glad to say. I may instance a very interesting development which has taken place in connection with one of the marine barracks, where one of the officers has started a school for teaching the duties of chauffeur. Both marines and seamen are taught the working of motor car engines a short time before they are likely to be discharged. In that way a great many men have been enabled to get places and have done extremely well. I entirely sympathise with the desire of the noble Lord to help his friends, but at the same time I am afraid I cannot hold out any hope that a special exception can be made in this matter in favour of the mercantile marine.

CHURCHES (SCOTLAND) COMMISSION.

***LORD REAY**: My Lords, I rise to ask the noble Earl the Chairman of the Churches (Scotland) Commission whether, in view of the anxiety in Scotland for an early settlement of the questions at issue, he can hold out any hopes of an early completion of the work of the Commission. I am well aware of the magnitude and intricacy of the questions with which the Churches' Commissioners in Scotland have to deal, and I am convinced that the delay which has occurred is not due to them, but to the difficulty of ascertaining the facts required to decide the various cases submitted to their tribunal.

An important decision has, however, been arrived at with regard to foreign missions in allocating the real property of those missions and the funds specially designated for those missions to the United Free Church. That decision will enable the Colleges of the United Free Church in India, whose excellent work I am sure my noble friend appreciates as much as I do, to carry on their educational schemes. Another important decision has been come to with regard to the normal schools which have been assigned to the United Free Church. This will make it possible to transfer these training colleges to the Government in accordance with the minute which was issued by the predecessor of the present Secretary for Scotland. The Commissioners have, I believe, intimated some time ago that they were going to allocate nearly 700 Churches. I believe that the Commissioners have also asked the agents of both Churches to draft the formal order which will be the future title to the property. It is obvious that great inconvenience arises to congregations owing to the suspense, and that irritation prevails in many quarters, which I am sure my noble friend will agree it is desirable to allay as soon as possible. I am aware that every means is being used to accelerate a decision, and that a yacht has been chartered to convey the assistant Commissioners who are making inquiries in the Highlands. A claim for statistics in the cases of Nairn, Petty and Saltcoats has been abandoned after considerable expense and labour had been spent in preparing these statistics. The bill of costs accruing to both Churches in regard to the inquiry is attaining very serious dimensions.

I trust that my noble friend will be able to give us some assurance that an early decision will be come to with regard to the head offices of the Churches. Great inconvenience arises from the fact that temporary offices have to be used. I hope there will also be an early decision with regard to the New College before the commencement of the new session, as the arrangements during the last two years have made it very difficult for the course of instruction in that college to be given with the necessary comfort secured to both professors and students. I am sure that no one is more anxious than my noble friend to arrive at a definite settlement of this matter, to which he has given so much care with his usual impartial spirit; and I am confident that his answer to my Question will convince both Churches that the Commissioners will not tolerate any delay which can be avoided and which is not imperatively required to arrive at a just verdict. I beg to ask the Question which stands in my name.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, I can assure my noble friend that I entirely appreciate and sympathize with the anxiety for a prompt conclusion of this business, and I think he will easily understand that there is no one so much interested in bringing about that happy event as I am myself. The time that was allotted to us in the Act of Parliament was until March last. I am not sure how that estimate was arrived at, but I am quite sure that most of us who were acquainted with the multiplicity of matters to be brought before the Commission were of opinion that the time allotted was insufficient; and so it has proved. The office of the Commission has been constantly working overtime.

The business that we have before us is twofold. We have, in the first place, to allocate the property to the congregations, and, in the second place, to deal with the central funds of the Church and we came to the conclusion that it was expedient to deal in the first instance with the congregational property. The total number of congregations falling under the Commission was 1,107. The number of cases that have been settled is 708, and there are something like 200 cases, mostly in large towns, which are practically settled. But there are 200 cases left, and of these eighty had to be dealt with by local inquiry, and of these local inquiries forty-six have already been held, and I believe I am right in saying that the remaining thirty-four have been so arranged as to be completed by the end of August.

There is one point with regard to these local inquiries which I think it right to mention, because it has been the cause to some extent of an extension of time being required. The Act provided that we should have power to appoint assistant Commissioners for this purpose, and it was our desire that the inquiries should be strictly local; but both churches united in representing to us that the statements must be prepared and in many cases argued by representatives from their central offices. I do not cavil at that decision. I mention it because it has caused delay and occupied the time of the gentlemen in the central offices and prevented them from submitting to us, as they otherwise might have been expected to do, the information we desired for dealing with the general schemes of the Churches.

There is another branch of inquiry which I do not think was foreseen as a very large one at the time the Act was passed, but which threatens to bulk somewhat abnormally, and that is dealing with legacies not actually in the possession of the Churches at the time of the division. I hope there will not be any similar delay in consequence. At any rate, we have taken steps to carry on the business as expeditiously as possible. My noble friend Lord Kinnear has agreed to sit *de die in diem* in order to deal with these matters, and though it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of all concerned, that we should have a short holiday in August, I believe he will agree to sit again early in September.

I do not wish my noble friend to suppose that we have neglected the consideration of the central funds and property. I do not think he is quite correct in saying that questions of title had been remitted to the agents of the Churches, though we have asked for certain papers from them which will enable us to decide as to that matter. With regard to foreign missions the decision we have arrived at will enable those who have the management of the property abroad to feel at their ease. But I want to make it clear that we have still retained in our hands, with regard to that portion of our commisson, the funds for foreign missions that are held in this country in order to deal with them when we come to decide on the central fund finally. We have also arranged for the drafting of a joint scheme for the widows' and orphans' fund, which I think will be of advantage to both Churches. With regard to the buildings in Edinburgh, I entirely appreciate the inconvenience which is caused by the present position, but I cannot help thinking that in that case, above all others, it is necessary to form our resolution with regard to the division of that property when we have fully made up our minds as to the proportions to be allocated to the different Churches.

I have mentioned that the time originally fixed for the completion of our work was March last. We obtained an extension of time, which was allowable under the Act, till September, and we have now applied for an extension to the end of the year. I regret the necessity, but it is inevitable; and I cannot absolutely say that that will be sufficient, because, after all, it does not wholly depend on the Commission. I do not want to dwell upon disagreeable topics, but I must in justice to that body remind your Lordships that we have to dispose of this delicate business in the face of a very bitter feeling between the parties themselves. It does not affect our relations with the parties; they have been throughout perfectly friendly and harmonious. I have nothing to withdraw from what was said in the report of the Royal Commission with regard to that state of feeling. I am afraid it still exists, and that it is responsible in some degree, at any rate, for some of the delay, and neither party can be held to be absolutely blameless. It is important to bear this in mind, because we are sometimes told that we might arbitrarily determine a point and bring things more rapidly to a conclusion. In our judgment, as this state of feeling exists, it is our duty to give the amplest opportunity to both sides to put any propositions they wish before us, and that they should be considered before we come to a conclusion. I can only say, on behalf of the Commissioners, that we shall not lose a single day, if we can help it, in bringing our work to a definite conclusion.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 20th July, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills. (See page 533.)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—London Squares and Enclosure Bill [Lords]; Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

London United Tramways Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; Watford Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords] (King's consent signified). Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Portsmouth Water Bill [Lords]; Ritz Hotel Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill, read the third time, and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords], Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords], Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords], read a second time, and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I.)

Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I of Private Bills; That at the meeting of the Committee a communication was received from Mr. Henry, one of the members of the said Committee, stating that he was unable, on account of his being summoned to take part in legal proceedings at Shrewsbury, to attend the Committee that day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill, Edinburgh Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Buntingford; Cerrig-y-drudion; Gedling (two); Long Ashton; Longgrove; and, Newcastle-on-Tyne; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Two Petitions from Reading, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Govan, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.

Petition from Islington, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL [LORDS].

Petitions from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PLURAL VOTING BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions from Gainsborough (two); for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SHOPS BILL.

Petitions from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Royal Leamington Spa, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND REGISTRY.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered April 11th; *Mr. Rowlands*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 16th; *Mr. Dillon*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Customs' Non-Pensioner Watchers.

Mr. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in dealing with the case of the Customs' watchers, he will give attention to the complaints of the non-pensioner watchers, in regard to their wages; and whether in view of the fact that for the past ten years, with very few exceptions, none but pensioners have been appointed to this position, he will consider the possibility of introducing a special measure for dealing with the salary of those watchers who have no pensions and whose services range from ten to forty years.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The non-pensioner and the pensioner watchers are engaged on the same duties. It would not, therefore, be possible to distinguish between them. I have, however, agreed to raise the pay of the watchers in London (excluding those stationed at Gravesend, Tilbury, and Queenborough), which is at present 21s. rising to 24s. a week, to 24s. a week in every case.

Police and Time Cribbing in Lancashire.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is in a position to state the names of the local authorities in Lancashire who have been asked their opinion as to the advisability of using the police to prevent the system of time cribbing; and will he state the nature of the replies received from each local authority separately.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The following Table gives the names of the local authorities consulted and summaries of their replies:—

Standing Joint Committee.	Summary of Reply.
Lancashire	Inexpedient to employ police for this purpose.

Watch Committee.	Summary of Reply.
Accrington	No serious objection, but inexpedient.
Ashton-under-Lyne	These duties should not be placed upon the police.
Bacup	The co-operation of the police would be inconvenient and not at all beneficial.
Blackburn	No objection.
Bolton	Undesirable that the police should have these further duties imposed upon them.
Burnley	The appointment of additional factory inspectors would more effectively meet the case.
Clitheroe	Exceedingly doubtful whether the proposal would have the desired effect, and the police are already overburdened.
Hyde	No objection, provided a grant were made.
Lancaster	Decided to take no steps in the matter.
Manchester	Undesirable to impose these duties on the police.
Oldham	Not possible for the police to undertake the work, owing to the large number of mills in the borough, unless the strength of the force be greatly increased.
Preston	Undesirable to impose these duties on the police.
Rochdale	No objection, provided sufficient compensation be given to police in respect of any increased cost of the police force.
Salford	Opposed to the proposal, as the police could not deal effectively with the matter and at the same time properly administer their ordinary police duties.
Stalybridge	Not advisable to employ the police in this way

Watch Committees.	Summary of Reply.
Stockport	- Think police could not deal with the matter without seriously neglecting their present duties, and do not consider that the police, even if given the necessary powers and an increase of staff, could deal with the matter as effectively or economically as a special staff of factory inspectors. They would oppose any proposal of the kind.
Warrington	- Consider that the work would best be left in the hands of the factory inspectors.
Wigan -	- Consider it undesirable to increase the duties of the police.

Annual Leave of Clerks of Surveyors of Taxes.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary of State to the Treasury whether he is aware that the chief clerks to surveyors of taxes all receive the same annual leave and increment, although they are graded in four classes; and, in view of the fact that in all other classification schemes promotion to a higher section brings increased leave and a higher increment, whether he will have this grievance inquired into, with a view to the clerks in the higher sections receiving better treatment in these respects after long service in the department.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The clerks allowed eighteen working days' leave are all "first clerks," and although graded for wages in four classes, with maximum wages of 50s., 60s., 65s., and 70s. per week, according to the importance of the districts in which they are respectively employed, yet their working hours are the same in all districts, and no good reason appears why there should be a differentiation in the amount of leave granted them. Clerks below the first clerks receive a smaller allowance of leave. In this arrangement there is nothing inconsistent with the general practice of the permanent service of the Crown, wherein promotion to a higher class does not always bring increased leave or a higher increment. It is true that the maximum increment which may be awarded is the same for all these clerks, but within that limit the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have power to determine it as they think proper.

Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the case of the clerks to surveyors of taxes was inquired into on the occasion of the surveyors' memorial last year, he will explain how long each member of the Board of Inland Revenue has served in such a capacity; whether the Board took the opinion of any of the surveyors of taxes on the subject, and seeing that the surveyors have been ignored on this subject, they being acquainted with the work their clerks performed, whether he will state if any member of the Board ever worked in a surveyor's office; and if he will order an impartial inquiry into the case of these clerks.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The periods of service of the several members of the Board of Inland Revenue in their present positions, are as follows:—

Chairman since 10th February, 1899.
Deputy Chairman since 29th May, 1902.
Commissioner since 23rd November, 1897.
Commissioner since 22nd February, 1902.

The Board inform me that on the subject of this memorial they took the opinion of the Chief Inspector of Taxes, who, with his assistants, has passed through the ranks of the surveyors' staff, and who is their responsible adviser in technical matters relating to that staff. No member of the Board has ever worked in a surveyor's office. I have no doubt that the inquiry was thoroughly impartial.

Vivisection Experiments at the Gordon College, Khartoum.

Mr. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to a series of vivisectional experiments performed on dogs, monkeys, and other animals by Andrew Balfour, M.D., at the Wellcome Research Laboratories, Gordon College, Khartoum; whether the Gordon College is under British control; whether the Welcome Research Laboratories form part of such college or what is their connection with it; how such laboratories are maintained, and whether or not by public money; whether vivisectional experiments are habitually performed at the Gordon College; whether operators are subject to any inspection, regulation, or control; and whether such practice is sanctioned by the British Government or their representatives in Egygt.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I have no information on the points mentioned in the Question, but I will make inquiries on the subject. The Gordon College at Khartoum is not under the control of the Foreign Office.

Public Elementary Schools.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can now say if a State-aided school will or will not be considered a public elementary school.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the reply given yesterday to a Question on one part of this matter, and to the Government Amendment to Clause 4, page 5, line 23, on the Paper circulated this morning.

Pay on Leave of Indian Civil Servants.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for India why officers in the Civil employment of the Government of India, who take combined leave to England, are not allowed to draw their pay for the privilege leave portion thereof in England; and whether he will consider the possibility of enabling them in future to draw such pay in England, in order that they may not, as at present, lose about 30 per cent. of their pay by loss on exchange, and, in addition to this loss, be compelled to pay income-tax on such pay both in India and in England.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I am willing to consult the Government of India as to the desirability of allowing privilege leave pay to be drawn in England when the leave is taken in this country in combination with other leave. No loss on exchange is incurred by the officers under the present arrangements nor it is likely any special rate of exchange will be conceded if it is decided to issue pay in England.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Patrick O'Brien; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Haviland-Burke.

Report to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order for Committee read.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I rise, Sir, to move the Motion that stands in my name. I am afraid I shall have to ask for a considerable draft on the patience of the House, because I have not only got to explain what I may call the stocktaking of our Indian accounts, but also, before I sit down, give some indications, of a tolerably clear and definite kind, I hope, of future policy. I hope the House will not grudge the time I ask. Although I am afraid I shall take some of the time that ought to go to those who wish to move Amendments, still they will all agree that I have never shown any great oratorical rapacity. I have no desire whatever unnecessarily to encroach on their time; but, after all, the occasion is not an unimportant one. This is a new Parliament, and I believe it has a long life before it. There are abundant signs that this new Parliament recognises to the full its highest responsibilities for the government of India. There is on the Paper a tolerably long scheme of Amendments, and I for one do not make any complaint whatever of it, although it is not altogether convenient from a personal point of view. When we consider all the questions that are involved in Indian policy, all the questions that are associated with this country as well as with

India, affecting not merely 300,000,000 people for whom we in this House are the trustees, but also affecting and going to the roots of the strength and stability of this Government and country, I think that India holds one of the three or four master keys of the strength of Great Britain. There are some people to whom Indian policy means the North-West Frontier, some to whom it means Persia, others to whom it means opium; but our Indian policy, when you come to look at it with responsibility, demands a far more comprehensive survey than this and a due sense of proportion. Of course, it is the tendency of every Minister to exaggerate the importance of his own office. But it is not in the least because I exaggerate the importance of my office that I do believe—I have believed long before I had anything to do with the Government of India—that of all the subjects which engage our attention—for example, in this session, education, taxation, foreign relations, the Army, the Fleet, North Africa, and South Africa—not one of them exceeds in moment and importance to this country the wisdom or unwisdom of the policy that is pursued in India. What portion of the great realm of Government raises more important and more striking issues than India? I am not speaking of the picturesque or the speculative points of view; I am looking at, and I invite this new Parliament to look at, the practical points involved in the government of India. There is the land frontier on the North-West that involves complex and intractable elements. I would invite the House in passing to notice the great, the enormous transformation of our foreign policy that has taken place since the days of Mr. Canning, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Castlereagh. We are no longer concerned in dynastic quarrels in Europe, nor even with territorial divisions in Europe. Whether it is for good or for ill, whether we like it or not, we see the transformation of our policy into an Asiatic policy.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) was understood to dissent.

*Mr. MORLEY: My hon. friend does not like that statement; I do not know that I do, but there is the fact. The most engrossing of our foreign relations now—and the noble Lord the Member for South Kensington who knows so much about these great questions will agree—the most engrossing and perplexing questions are those which involve us with China, Japan, Russia, the great Power in Central Asia, apart from its European sphere. I hope hon. Members will pardon me making this digression. I thought at the time we took a very bad, false step three or four years ago in South Africa. That false step has landed us in inextricable confusion; that is bad enough. But a really false step taken in India would land us in confusion far more dire and disastrous still. The interest of the people of Great Britain in Indian questions is supposed to be languid, and to judge from the appearance of the benches opposite the Imperial Party do not show interest in far the greatest of all Imperial questions.

An HON. MEMBER: There are only six of them.

*Mr. MORLEY: Their interest may be languid, but, after all, I like to be indulgent. I do not believe that, in the country, among those who think about our political position at all, the interest is languid. But even if it were, there are some pretty obvious reasons for it. The subject is very intricate, the terms are unfamiliar, the whole field is vast, distant, and even to us who are concerned with it, very dim. And this subject kindles none of the fire of Party, which as we all know is the most attractive element in securing crowded benches and long speeches. But when people say that India has always been excluded from the sphere of Party I do not believe that that is at all historically true. After all, when we turn to old occurrences under Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox, and even if we come down to 1880, when Mr. Gladstone won his great and triumphant election, somewhat similar to an election that has followed it, we find some of the very hardest fights in our Party history have been fights on Indian questions. I am glad to think that at this moment India is not in any sense or degree a Party question. I believe that between myself and the noble Lord opposite, who has had India Office experience, there is only a very moderate degree of difference of opinion.

My hon. friend the Member for Merthyr has put on the Paper a Motion, not unfamiliar, for placing the salary of the Secretary of State upon the Estimates, so that there might be an opportunity, as there is on Irish or Scottish policy, of indulging in criticism and, if possible, of discomfiting the Secretary of State. I have considered all the arguments pretty carefully, and heard many debates in this House on that proposition, and I submit this to my hon. friend, and to the House if he divides on the Motion. We are all agreed it is best and wisest to exclude India from the field of our ordinary Party operations. See, then, what my hon. friend's proposal would mean. On a debate on the Secretary of State's salary my hon. friend very likely would move a reduction of the salary of the Secretary of State by £100, and he would, I am sure, make a considerable number of reasonable criticisms. But does he not see that when it came to a division it could not but be a Party vote? All the supporters of the Ministry, or nearly all, would go into the lobby to give the Secretary of State his salary, and Gentlemen opposite very likely might, in spite of their desire to keep India out of Party politics, support the reduction of salary. I cannot think that would do any good. In subjecting details of Indian administration to the supervision and criticism of this House, the Indian Government would be exposed to the kind of criticism which would do no good, but harm. As I say, the question has often been discussed in this House before. I think Lord George Hamilton spoke in this sense in resisting a similar Motion, as I am sorry to say I must resist my hon. friend's to-day. You might do as you used in old Parliaments, every twenty years have a committee or commission to travel over the whole field of Indian government and report upon it. My objection to that would be that it would be absurd to bring home all the hard-working capable men who are engaged in the day-to-day administration of the enormous Government in order to hear questions which would not in all cases be dictated by knowledge, but partly by prejudice and partly by passion. I should be sorry to see that. But I think it would be of the greatest advantage that there should be discussions from time to time on particular questions, either taken out of Supply, or perhaps a lenient Government with plenty of time might give time. For example, I think three or four hours might well be spent in this House in discussing education. I have some views of my own about education, and I should very well like to have this House decide the issues that that question opens. Then there is an enormous question in which Radicals in old days used to be deeply interested, and I see no reason why those not Radicals should not be interested in it—namely, the partition of the cost of military operations between India and England. I have a very shrewd suspicion that that partition of charge is not in all respects equitable.

I am afraid I must now take the House through a series of figures. I will make them as short as I can. This I ask the House to believe, that in these figures are the real issues; and if you at all realise your responsibility, you must not grudge the intervention of these rather harassing and—though not to me—rather tiresome figures. In reciting these figures to the House, I hope it will not be thought that I am holding a brief. To say that I am not indebted to the capable and helpful gentlemen in my office, and in India also, would be the highest ingratitude on my part. But I view these things with an impartial and independent eye; and therefore I hope the House will not listen to my figures as if they were listening to a lawyer reading a brief. When I look at the string of Amendments on the Paper I cannot but think that they mean if they mean anything, that the Government of India by this country is a dead failure.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) Hear, hear.

*MR. MORLEY: I do not believe a word of it. I do not say that it is incapable of improvement. Like everything else in this world, it is capable of improvement. But the figures I am going to recite to the House are cheerful and encouraging. The net revenue of

India in 1904–5 was £49,700,000—I leave out the thousands—the net expenditure was £46,300,000, and the surplus was £3,400,000. In 1905–6, the revenue was £48,500,000, the expenditure was £46,700,000, and the surplus £1,800,000. I now come to the figures of the current year, which, of course, are estimates only:—Revenue, £48,800,000; expenditure, £48,000,000; surplus, £800,000. For some years before 1901–2 the revenue was exposed to certain unfavourable conditions, with which I need not weary the House; but since then, owing to various causes—the absence of any widespread famine principally—the surpluses have been enlarged. What can we do with the surplus? We can remit taxation. I begin with the remission of the tax which I regard of great importance—the salt duty. The salt duty has been reduced since 1903–4 by two steps, at a cost of £2,000,000 to the revenue. Rates have been reduced £690,000, and income-tax £200,000. In 1903 my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Duchy, then in Opposition, made a very powerful appeal in favour of the further remission of the salt duty. That remission has been made. But for my part I cannot regard, and I will not regard, with satisfaction, or even with patience, the continuance at a high scale of a tax on a prime necessity of life. It is a question, however, that you cannot settle right off, or by a stroke of the pen. But any one who reads the report in the Blue-book published this year will see that the last remission of the tax, which was considerable, has had a most admirable effect in cheapening the retail price; and the knowledge that they were entitled to the reduction has become known to the most ignorant class in the country. Even the Bheel woman who buys salt by the ounce knows that she is entitled to more than she used to get. What was formerly purchased to last three or four days, now lasts five or six days. More salt is also given to cattle. In some provinces the consumption has risen 10 per cent. in the last three years, and the saving per head of the population is reckoned as one day's wages to the poorest of the working classes. I have some figures as to the comparative effect of the imposition of the salt tax in India and in a famous European country where the tax is still imposed—namely, Italy—but they can wait for another occasion. It is not that the Indian is more heavily burdened in the matter of the salt duty than the Italian. But, however that may be, I am glad to think that the very able and expert financial member of the Viceroy's Council hopes to make further reduction in the duty, even though he cannot go so far as I should like to go, and sweep the thing away altogether. Let us therefore be content to take the half-loaf, for it is better than no bread.

I should like the House fully to realise the significance of this financial statement. The rise in the national income of which I have spoken is automatic, and is derived, I am glad to think, from the taxpayers for value received. Here are significant figures. The land revenue has gone up by £1,500,000, because the productive value of the land has gone up and more land is brought under cultivation. The Excise has increased by £1,500,000—partly due, no doubt, to higher duties; but due also to increased consumption. We are all economists since the raising of fiscal reform. We therefore know that this rise in consumption must be due to increased purchasing power, and consequently to greater wage earning. Customs have risen more than half a million sterling. Customs in India are levied for revenue purposes only. Why have they risen? Because more manufactured goods of particular kinds have been bought. Still, the most important tributary of the stream so copiously fed from so many affluents is the State railways. I make a present of that fact to my Socialist friends below the gangway opposite. In India the State undertakes not only railways, but other gigantic operations for the direct development of the economic resources of the country. It constructs railways and canals; it conducts irrigation operations; it conserves forests. The net revenue under the three heads of railways, canals, and forests, five years ago, was only £2,750,000. What is it to-day? £5,000,000. Therefore, there is a large net increase from these socialistic operations.

The Indian railway system is really worth thinking about for a moment. It is nearly 30,000 miles in extent, and is growing at the rate of 1,000 miles a year. In the United Kingdom the railway system is 22,634 miles in extent; in Russia it is 40,500 miles, and in the United States 212,000 miles. Of course, we must also look at the areas of the countries concerned. The area of India is 1,000,000 square miles, the area of Russia is 8,500,000 square miles, and the area of the United States is 3,500,000 square miles. These are striking figures. But let me quote a few more figures about passengers and merchandise. In 1905 there were 250,000,000 of passengers and 56,000,000 tons of goods. The average charge for each passenger was one-fifth of a penny per mile, and the average charge for goods was a halfpenny a ton a mile. I would ask my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade to try whether he cannot bring about a reduction in railway rates and charges in this country to those low amounts. The loss which formerly existed on the State railways fell gradually, until in 1899–1900 it turned to a modest gain of £70,000, and this steadily mounted until 1904–5, when it topped £2,000,000. The economic effects of this great beneficent action on the part of the Government to aid private industry must be pretty obvious to everyone in the House, as, for example, in connection with the transportation of produce to districts afflicted with scarcity and famine from districts which are more prosperous, in connection with inland migration which is of peculiar importance in India, where, though many districts are poor, others are worse than poor, and also in connection with the rapid and satisfactory increase in commerce, in the value of imports and exports and of all those commercial operations which would have been impossible, but for this development of railway communication. There are other effects which I need not dwell upon, political and social; but these political and social effects are only perfectly known to those who have studied this matter personally.

Now I must say a word about irrigation, because I am endeavouring to show that India is not an inert and lifeless bureaucracy of official machinery, but a great vital scheme of government. I do not say that it has not had some defects—we shall come to those in the course of the afternoon. But I wish I had time to dwell on the achievements in irrigation, demanding such skill in engineering, such thought and prudence, such energy in day-to-day administration. Some of the Amendments on the Paper, I think, do less than justice to the vigour with which the great public works of India have been prosecuted, increasing the productivity of the ordinary land, protecting areas specially liable to famine, and bringing waste lands into cultivation. I will only mention that the capital expenditure on the large canals up to the end of 1906–7 was £28,000,000, yielding a revenue of 7¾ per cent. This year £1,250,000 is provided for maintenance and construction, in addition to other sums for minor works.

One single word as to afforestation: that is a question not only which concerns us but which will concern somebody standing at this box long after we are gone. The State forests of India cover an area of 250,000 square miles, and 66,000,000 cubic feet of timber from the State forests were extracted last year, and there has been an increase in the forest revenues in five years of more than £600,000. I cannot wonder that those who are concerned in these operations look forward with nothing short of exultation to the day when this country will realise what a splendid asset is now being built up in India in connection with these forests.

There is one point in connection with India to which I must refer, and that is her debt. The policy of many nations is crippled by the haunting spectral figure of debt. India, whatever gloom, famine, and plague may spread over her landscape, is at least happy in her immunity from a great burden of national debt. The total permanent debt of India at March 31st, 1905, was £214,000,000. You may think that a pretty large figure for a poor country. But of this no less than £154,000,000 is represented in railways and irrigation works, leaving only

£60,000,000 of ordinary debt. The net charge this year for interest other than interest on railways and irrigation works is £800,000, so that you have the important fact that the revenue from railways and major irrigation works, after meeting all charges for working and interest, covers the interest on the ordinary debt about four times over. That is a very striking and remarkable fact.

I should now like to pass from these figures of revenue to those of trade. As we all know, a tremendous controversy raged in this country some little time ago as to whether exports or imports are the more trustworthy sign of national prosperity. Happily in India it does not matter a pin whether you take exports or imports as a test of national prosperity. Ten years ago the value of Indian merchandise and produce exported was £73,000,000; last year it was £105,500,000, or an increase of 44½ per cent. Ten years ago the value of imported merchandise into India was £46,250,000; last year it was £68,750,000, or an increase of 48½ per cent. The value of the gold and silver held in India outside the currency has increased by £9,000,000 a year for five years. Everybody knows that for good or ill the collection of precious metals is practised in India by all classes. But I have some figures here about the rise in prices which are also satisfactory. Some hon. Member who will follow me will be able, with perfect good faith in their own minds, to paint the condition of the population of India in lamentable colours, just as you could do in this country. The distribution of material prosperity over this vast continent is unequal, and when the hon. Gentleman, whoever he may be, tells this lamentable story, you must remember also that the standard is low. Remember that India is essentially an agricultural country and of varying degrees of fertility. Pessimist or optimist may make out an equally good case if they go into particular parts of India. There are regions in India which are very poor; but on the other hand if you go to Bengal, to Burmah, and the irrigated portions of the Punjab you will find lands as fertile as any in the world. That India is a poor country I do not deny; that the system of government is costly I know; that it is extravagant I suspect. But there is not one of these three things I could not say of my own country. We on this side constitute a majority who are prepared to say that our system of government is costly—I should think it is—and that it is in some respects extravagant. That is what we are all here to say. But let us remark the signs of improvement among the diverse populations of India. An experienced native officer in the course of a review of his work in Scinde speaks of the possession in greater quantity among the people in the villages of articles of copper and brass, finer garments and silver and gold, as well as of houses being built of brick and tiles in place of mud; and what has been said by this native officer of Scinde has also been said by native observers in other parts of India. Then you find among the natives such new-fangled inventions as the sewing-machine, a machine for crushing the sugar-cane instead of the old rude stone implement, and the growing use of mineral oil, which is cheap and powerful, instead of vegetable oil. There are some people who would be glad to see the people engaged in those indigenous handicrafts which belong to India. I am not sure that I do not belong to that retrograde race. But we cannot go back; India will not confine herself to those indigenous handicrafts. From the report of the Chief Inspector of Factories I find that last year was a year of extraordinary prosperity in the Bombay cotton mills, but that does not at all prevent my adhesion to a promise which I mentioned to a deputation to despatch an English factory inspector to see how factory rules, such as we have in England, will work, having regard to the different social conditions of Inda.

The House will not think that I am wearying them unnecessarily and will permit me to say a few words on India's relations to free trade. Lord George Hamilton, after he had ceased to be Secretary of State, was one of the most powerful exponents from the Indian point of view of the impossibility of setting up preferential and discriminating tariffs. There was also, I think, laid before Parliament an important and well-weighed despatch from Lord Curzon. Sir, I think the House will allow me, when I mention the name of that distinguished man, to say that I cannot fail to remember that nobody has ever been more conspicuous or passionate in his self-sacrificing devotion to the interests of India than Lord Curzon. I think the House will desire also that I should express our sympathy with him in the cruel blow that has made his hearth desolate, and that our deepest sympathy with him at this time may help him to bear the stroke with fortitude. I do not, however, labour the question of free trade, because really the Indian case in this great controversy lies in a nutshell. The strength of India, the prosperity and comfort of India, her trade and commerce hang on exports. If the market for her foodstuffs and raw materials, her grain, timber, tea and coffee, hides and oilseeds, is not ample in volume and favourable in its circumstances how is she to bear the weight of her obligations? How does she stand? In 1905–6 the export trade, including Government stores, was £105,000,000; her imports were £69,000,000. But here is the cardinal fact. I am thinking of preferential and discriminating tariffs in favour of the United Kingdom. Of this £105,000,000 the United Kingdom only took 25 per cent. Where did the other 75 per cent., the other three-quarters of the exports go? The chief customers for the three-fourths of the exports were the States of Europe, the Far East, and the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give us the relative proportions of exports from India to the free trade States of the Far East as compared with the protective States of Europe?

*MR. MORLEY: I am not sure that I can off hand, but perhaps I may be able to give the information later in the afternoon; but it cannot affect this point, whatever may be the answer to the noble Lord's question. This preferential and discriminating policy carries with it that if India is asked to retaliate and to introduce a preference in our favour, you are asking her to discriminate against three-fourths of her customers in order to satisfy one. I think that is the case in a nutshell. I will give an illustration from a Foreign Office Report on German trade in 1905. It is stated there that in the last four years Germany's bill for Indian produce has risen from £10,750,000 to £14,750,000 per annum, and that the value of German goods sold to India has only risen from £3,900,000 to £4,150,000. What conclusion is to be drawn from that? There are three conclusions to be drawn. First, that the industrial development of Germany does India, at all events, no harm but good, by widening the market for the raw produce that India has to sell. The second conclusion carries with it the question, "Who gains from this purchasing power of India?" Why, England, because the Indian imports are from the United Kingdom. Lastly, how could it be India's interest to injure a good customer like Germany by a discriminating tariff in favour of English goods?

You may say if you like that I have been painting to you a roseate picture, but in military expenditure, however, we have the shadow. Comparing broadly 1906–7 with the figures of ten years ago, there is an increase in the strength of the Army of 4,147 men. In 1896–7 the strength of the Indian Army was 227,460 men, and in 1906–7 231,607 men. But the remarkable circumstance comes out that in British cavalry and infantry there is no increase. The only important additions to the fighting strength of the Army are an increase in our artillery and an increase in the number of British officers to the tune of 1,000. That is a large and costly addition, but I will not argue it now. The net Army expenditure in India, British and native, in 1896–7 was £15,100,000; the estimate for 1906–7 is £18,800,000—an increase of £3,700,000. This has to be divided into two equal items of £1,850,000 for ordinary and special military expenditure. I invite the House to attend to one element in the increase in the ordinary expenditure. The House will remember that the late Government found it necessary to grant additional pay to the non-commissioned officers and men in the British Army in India. Those were circumstances for which neither the Government nor the governed in India had a shadow of responsibility. They were not responsible for those social circumstances which made it necessary to add to the pay of the British soldier, but the increase of pay in the British contingent of the Indian military force was saddled on India to the tune of nearly £1,000,000. I now go for a moment to the special military expenditure associated with the name of Lord Kitchener. From all the information that reaches me His Majesty's Government have every reason to be satisfied with the prudence of the decision in the vexed and turbid question of Army organisation which I conveyed to the Government of India in my despatch of February or March last. I have carefully watched these operations and I have obtained whatever information I could get on the subject; and I say that in my opinion we have every reason to be satisfied with the decision we then took. I do not discuss Lord Kitchener's scheme and the expense as a whole. In the present stage it is not ripe for discussion, but I will only say that I am engaged in active correspondence with the Government of India upon the various questions involved in this special military expenditure in Lord Kitchener's scheme, and until that correspondence, which also involves some decisions to be taken by the Imperial Defence Committee, is matured I do not think I can say anything at this stage that would be very profitable for the House to listen to. In anticipation of the discussion in the course of the afternoon, I may say, however, that after all you should be fair to the soldiers and generals, and you must look at these things as they were presented. Lord Kitchener's scheme is not one for increasing the Army. What is contended by way of justification is that if the scheme had not been adopted India would have continued to spend £17,000,000 a year on an Army provided with second-rate guns, with too few officers, with bad transport, with defective medical organisation, inadequate reserves of stores. It is said that by paying this £2,000,000 extra for five years, and £1,500,000 for recurrent charges for a certain number of years, you will have avoided all the mischiefs and shortcomings which I have described. That is the military defence. Behind that there lies, no doubt, a large number of disputable facts, inferences, and conclusions. In indicating this controversy I am not going to pledge myself to any line as far as the present Budget is concerned. I hope the House will not think that is arrogant on my part. On the contrary, it is modesty. I am not going into this complex and dangerous question without making perfectly sure that I have all the information to which I can possibly get access and that I have listened to all the arguments which can be brought against the views I am personally inclined to take.

I am drawing to an end; but I am not sure that the end is not the most important part of what I have to say. I have heard a thousand times that India is an insoluble problem. Well, the man who runs away from problems called "insoluble" is not fit for politics. I have generally found, as I daresay some of my right hon. friends have found, that what is called an insoluble problem is after all a problem wrongly stated. Here we have a new Parliament. I respectfully invite the new Parliament of to-day to look at the India of to-day with a clear, firm, and steadfast gaze. I have only been in office a very few months, but I will say of myself—and I hope it will not seem egotistic—that I have lost no opportunity of placing myself in contact with as many people as possible from India, people of every type, of every class, likely to take every different point of view. I have seen native rulers from India—"dusk faces, in white silken turbans wreathed"—and I sometimes think we made a mistake in not attaching the weight we ought to to these powerful princes as standing forces in India. Then it has been my businesss to hear all I could learn from those military officers who keep watch and ward along our frontier among the fierce border tribes, and no men interested me more. I have seen what is called the "sun-dried bureaucrat," and I have found that what is meant by that phrase is a man eminent for experience, for knowledge, and for responsibility faithfully and honourably discharged. I have seen soldiers, travellers, and journalists, and I have kept up a continuous and most useful and interesting correspondence with the Viceroy. Again I hope the House will not think it egotistic, but I want them to know why I have any right to take any view at all as to the situation in India. If I were to say that on the strength of these conversations, many and long, I pretend to know all about India, I should be foolish. I do not dogmatise. The man who dogmatises at all in politics is not, I suspect, the wisest of men. But the man who dogmatises about India—and I throw this out for this afternoon's discussion—is a pure simpleton. I throw that out promiscuously. I have done my best to read the signs of to-day in India, and it is for the India of to-day that the Government and this House are responsible. I do not believe for a moment that because you have a comparatively new Viceroy and a new Secretary of State, that is enough to make a crisis in this vast dominion. What I seem to discern are not at all the symptoms of crisis. I do not see or hear demands for violent or startling new departures. What I do see is a stage reached in the gradual and inevitable working out of Indian policy, which makes it wise and in the natural order of things—and I do not at all despair of securing the noble Lord's agreement to this—that we should advance with a firm, courageous, and intrepid step some paces further on the path of continuous, rational improvement in the Indian system of government. Every one—soldiers, travellers, and journalists—they all tell us that there is a new spirit abroad in India. Be it so. How could you expect anything else? You have now been educating the peoples for years with Western ideas and literature. You have already given them facilities for communication with one another. How could you suppose that India would go on just as it was when there was little higher education and when the contact between one part and another was difficult and infrequent? How could you think that all would go on as before? As for education, let the House think of this little fact. There is this year a Senior Wrangler from India; and I was told by the Master of Trinity that he was Senior Wrangler after two years' residence when all the others in the class had had three years' residence. I mention that as showing that you cannot go on narrowly on the old lines. We should be untrue to all the traditions of this Parliament and to those who from time to time and from generation to generation have been the leaders of the Liberal Party, if we were to show ourselves afraid of facing and recognising the new spirit with candour and consideration. I said something about the Indian Princes. It is a question whether we do not persist in holding these powerful men too lightly. Then there is the Congress. I do not know that I agree with all that the Congress desires; but, speaking broadly of what I conceive to be at the bottom of the Congress, I do not see why any one who takes a cool and steady view of Indian Government should be frightened. I will not at once conclude that because a man is dissatisfied and discontented, therefore he is disaffected. Our own reforms and changes have been achieved by dissatisfied men who were no more disaffected than you or I. If there be disaffection—and there may be some—I will not, as far as I have anything to do with the Government of India, play the game of disaffection by exaggerating the danger or by over-readiness to scent mischief. There have been two books recently written about India by gentlemen who accompanied the Prince of Wales, which I would respectfully recommend hon. Members to read. One of these books, "Through India with the Prince," is by Mr. Abbot, and the other is by a gentleman, Mr. Sydney Low, of proved competence in political subjects. Mr. Low is a man who knows what he is writing about; and he says—

> "The journey of the Prince of Wales showed clearly that there is a deep and widespread attachment to the Imperial House among the Indian people; and even where there is discontent with the mode of Government, there is no feeling against the Throne. Calcutta, when the Prince of Wales visited it, was in the trough of a furious agitation against the partition of Bengal—an agitation which on one occasion had caused every native shop to be closed in the city as a sign of mourning. Yet when the Prince appeared amongst this angry populace, he was received not only with cordiality, but even with demonstrative enthusiasm."

I am not going, and I hope the House is not going, to be easily frightened when it finds such a state of things, together with other facts which are no doubt disagreeable. But that is what politics are. There is a constant ebb and flow of feeling in the countries where there is any political life, and this shows that political life is stirring in India. I deprecate this bandying between different schools of Indian opinion of charges and epithets. One says, "Sundried bureaurats," and the other says, "Pestilent agitators." But the duty of the Viceroy, of the Secretary of State, and of the House of Commons is to rise well above that sort of thing. An observation—a just and salutary observation—has been made that we should adopt not a mawkish or maudlin sentimentality, but a manly desire to understand and comprehend those whom, for good or for evil, we have undertaken to govern. We have not ourselves to blame for the great division that separates the European from the native Indian. I have sometimes wondered why those who now agitate for political reforms dc not turn their eyes to social reforms. But there is a root of statesmanship as well as of humanity contained in the lines "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, affections, and passions?" That is what I should like to make the foundation of the education of our competition-wallahs. It was well said once that "great thoughts come from the heart"—a beautiful expression, but I should like to add to it a little prosaic rider of my own—great thoughts come from the heart, but they must go round by the head.

And now I come to close quarters. In all that I have said I shall not be taken to indicate for a moment that I dream you can transplant British institutions wholesale into India. That is a fantastic and ludicrous dream. Even if it could be done, it would not be for the good of India. You have got to adapt your institutions to the conditions of the country where you are planting them. You cannot transplant bodily the venerable oak of our constitution to India, but you can transplant the spirit of our institutions—the spirit, the temper, the principles, and the maxims of British institutions. All these you can transplant and act upon and abide by. You cannot give universal suffrage in India, and I do not insist that India should be on the same footing as our self-governing Colonies, like Canada. In the debate on the Indian Council Act in 1892, in this House, Mr. Gladstone said:

> "In all these proposals for improved government in India the Government of India must have the carrying out of those proposals."

That is what he said, and I believe more and more from my own experience that that is a proved view. I rejoice, and I believe the House will rejoice, that I am authorised to announce on my full responsibility that the Government of India is in thorough sympathy with the necessities of the day and of the hour. I only want the House to know that we are in earnest in the direction that I have indicated. I hope there will be no hurry or precipitancy on the part either of the bureaucrats or of the agitators. If there is, it can only have the effect, the inevitable effect, of setting the clock back. We are talking to-day about the Budget. The very limited amount of time given to the discussions of the Budget in Calcutta has hitherto been rather a scandal. All reasonable people both here and in India have admitted that that state of things cannot be endured. Then there is also the question of the moving of Amendments to the financial proposals of the Viceroy and his advisers. There is the extension of the representative element in the Legislative Council—not the Executive Council, but the Legislative. These are three points bearing closely upon our discussion to-day, and I am glad to say that the Governor-General is about to appoint a small committee from his Executive Council to consider what reforms in this direction can be expediently carried forward. I have every reason to believe that I shall before the end of the session have a despatch from the Government of India empowering me to state to this House the definite results at which the Governor-General and his committee have arrived. In regard to the question of the employment of Indians in the higher offices, I think a move—a definite and deliberate move—ought to be made with the view of giving competent and able natives the same access to the higher posts in the administration that are given to our own countrymen.

There is a famous sentence in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, which says:—

> "It is our further will that so far as may be our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service the duties of which they may be qualified by their educational talents, ability and integrity duly to discharge."

I think those words "so far as may be" have been somewhat misinterpreted in the past. I do not believe that the Ministers who advised Queen Victoria in framing one of the most memorable documents in all our history meant those qualifying words, which were words of common sense and wisdom, to be construed in a narrow, literal, restricted, or pettifogging spirit. I do not believe that Parliament or the liberal and generous men who held the helm of State in India at that time ever intended that this promise of the Queen's should be construed in any but a liberal and generous sense. The Governor-General of India to-day is, I am glad to say, a man of a firm texture of mind. I do not believe the Governor-General has any intention of riding off on a narrow evasion of the obvious spirit of those words containing a promise which was as wise and politic as it was just. I thank the House for listening to me so long. I do not know if there is any case in history of an autocratic person or absolute government co-existing with free speech and free right of meeting; but it is quite certain that for as long a time as my poor imagination can pierce through, for so long a time our government in India must partake, and in no small degree, of the personal and almost absolute element. But that is no reason why we should not try this great experiment of showing that you can have a strong and effective administration along with free speech and free institutions, and being all the better and all the more effective because of free speech and free institutions. That policy is a noble one to think of, but the task is arduous; and because it is noble and because it is arduous I recommend the policy of which I have only given a broad outline, to the adoption of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for Committee on East India Revenue Accounts.)"

*EARL PERCY congratulated the right hon. Gentleman both on the character of the statement he had made and on the charm with which his eloquence and lucidity had invested it. The House would await with great interest the recommendations of the Committee which had been appointed in regard to the giving of a larger amount of time in Calcutta to the consideration of the Budget and the making of further provisions for the representation of natives in the Legislative Council. He supposed that any change in the composition of the Legislative Council would require legislation in this House.

MR. MORLEY: Any increase in numbers.

*EARL PERCY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman contemplated an increase in the numbers.

MR. MORLEY: Not necessarily.

*EARL PERCY said he believed th right hon. Gentleman's view in regard to the employment of Indians in the higher posts of the administration had been the view of successive Secretaries of State. If there had been any impediment to the employment of Indians, it was not the bar of colour, for the only qualifications for employment in such posts were education, character, and experience. No doubt in time there would be a far larger proportion of natives than at present who had the training calculated to fit them for the occupancy of such posts. He associated himself with the eloquent words in which the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his sympathy with Lord Curzon. The death of Lady Curzon was felt as a real and personal loss by India as a whole, and he could only hope that the sympathy of this House and of the people of India would afford some consolation to Lord Curzon in his bereavement. The statement which the right hon. Gentleman had laid before the House was certainly not less satisfactory than those which had been submitted in recent years by his predecessors. Trade showed a remarkable expansion, and the Government were once more in a position which enabled them to make a very large reduction of taxation and also budget for a surplus of about

£800,000 in the coming year. It might possibly be said that the constant recurrence of these enormous surpluses was evidence of over-prudence on the part of the Finance Minister, a prudence for which there was less justification now that the railways, instead of showing a deficit, had become an asset, yielding a profit of 5¼ per cent. on the capital, and the stability of the rate of exchange was now practically guaranteed by the possession of a gold reserve fund amounting to something like £12,000,000. But it was better to give relief from taxation gradually than to give it in large amounts only to withdraw it in a year or two. As to the method in which the Government had disposed of their surplus, he thought very little criticism was possible. During the last two years they had given considerable relief, both to the direct and indirect taxpayer, by successive reductions of the salt tax and by raising the limit of exemption from the income-tax. The salt tax now stood at a lower level than it had ever done since it was imposed, and the last reduction was followed by a gratifying increase in the consumption. He agreed that it had not yet reached its lowest desirable limit, but he had some doubts about the expediency of abolishing the salt tax altogether, because it was a reserve in time of war. The same observation might be made in regard to the income-tax, which only produced a little more than £1,000,000 a year, which was not an excessive contribution on the part of the moneyed class in India. The right hon. Gentleman had tempted the House to enter into a discussion of the interests of India in connexion with preferential tariffs. In his opinion, if there was any risk of the adoption of that policy by India, it was more likely to arise from a demand by the Indian people themselves than from any agitation at home. The argument which the right hon. Gentleman based on the fact that of the total exports of India England took only one-fourth and three-fourths were taken by other countries was not conclusive. Foreign European countries which had protectionist tariffs and used taxation for the purposes of retaliation and negotiation took only a small proportion of the three-fourths. By far the larger proportion went to Egypt or countries in the Far East. The countries which took three-fourths of the export trade had no protectionist tariffs. They did not compete with us seriously in the Indian market as importers, and, therefore, they would not suffer from a preferential tariff and would not be under any temptation, even if their fiscal policy allowed them, to embark on a retaliatory war. He should like to say that he had read with particular satisfaction the outspoken defence by the Finance Minister of the present Customs tariff. There was a time when the reimposition of that tariff was regarded as a retrograde step, but he gathered that that view had been abandoned. It brought in a large revenue without hampering trade as might be seen from the increasing imports of cotton and sugar. In Egypt, which was administered by a pronounced free trader, one-tenth of the total revenue was derived from Customs import duties; whereas in India it was only one-twentieth. It had always seemed to him that if the financial system of India was open to any criticism, it was that too large a proportion of the revenue was drawn either from taxation on the actual necessaries of life or from taxation on the staple industry, in which 80 per cent. of the total population were engaged. Of the total taxation per head, now amounting to 3s. 6d. a year, 1s. 10d. was derived from land revenue. Although, no doubt, the land revenue represented rent rather than taxation, the necessity of giving remissions and suspensions had been forced on the Indian Government in many successive years, and he thought they had done quite right this year to devote the larger part of their surplus to the relief of that industry The grants and remissions which had been made, with the very large expenditure on protective as apart from productive works, represented a very considerable boon to the class of whose poverty they had heard so much. With regard to the first of the two problems which, he gathered, were mainly engaging the attention of the Government of India—the effect of famine relief upon the resources at the disposal of the provincial Governments—he thought it ought not to be impossible to devise some system under which a contribution from the Imperial Exchequer towards famine relief should be made *pari passu* with, and to a certain extent proportionate to, the contributions which were made from the provincial Exchequers. The rule that Imperial funds could not be drawn upon until the whole of the provincial revenues had been exhausted was conceived in the interests of economical administration, but it operated unfairly as between different provinces and was fatal to any systematic outlay on local improvements. As to the second problem, the indebtedness of the peasant, the Government of India passed, some years ago, for the Punjab alone, an Act to prevent the alienation of land by the cultivator. The success of that Act was evidenced by the falling off in the receipts from stamps, but he did not gather that the policy was one which the Government of India proposed to apply universally. He thought it could hardly be regarded as affording alleviation for the poverty which, whether due to the improvidence of the cultivator or not, was the mainspring and the cause of his recourse to borrowing. The Government of India were, he thought, on the right track when they looked for a solution of this evil of agricultural indebtedness to such measures as the encouragement of more liberal advances to the peasantry, which lowered the rate of interest generally and made it impossible for the money-lender to extort his excessive terms, the exemption of improvements from assessment, and the encouragement of the growth and extension of those co-operative societies, the initiation of which had been attended with conspicuous success. He could not help hoping that it might be possible for the Government of India to give to other industries similar assistance to that which they were giving to the steel industry, and that the growth of such industries would enable India to derive more advantage from the policy recently announced that in all State contracts preference would be given to goods of native origin, where the quality was the same, over goods which were imported from abroad. He now came to the question of military expenditure, and the particular method by which the Government of India intended to meet it. It was suggested by more than one speaker in the debate in the Viceroy's Council that the scheme of military re-armament might be postponed, or altogether abandoned, in view of the present weakness of Russia and of the additional security which India got from the terms of the Japanese Alliance. He drew an exactly opposite inference from those two considerations. History certainly showed that exhaustion produced by a great war was not necessarily a bar to the early resumption of aggressive measures on a protracted scale, and he thought they must feel, if the adoption of a scheme of invasion, however futile it might be, was within even the remotest bounds of possibility, that the possibility became less remote only in proportion as the States which bordered upon India were in a settled rather than in an anarchic condition. Were the Government on account of the Japanese Alliance to abate one iota of their military precautions they would not only be throwing grave discredit on the self-reliance and patriotism of the Indian people, but they would be acting contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Anglo-Japanese Agreement. That agreement was not intended to relieve either of the parties of their respective obligations for their own self-defence, and, obviously, if it were to have that effect, the allied forces would be less and not more effective for combined action when the emergency arose. He should like to know to what extent the military expenditure was to be devoted to works of a permanent kind. It was intended to defray the whole ten millions out of revenue, but he thought that as India had attained a financial position, especially in regard to debt, such as had been attained in no European country, we were hardly warranted in imposing upon her an adherence to rigid maxims of financial caution to which we had not always paid strict allegiance ourselves. He hoped that during the right hon. Gentleman's term of office they might have the advantage and pleasure of listening to other statements from him as satisfactory as that to which they had just listened.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) in moving, "That, in view of the responsibility of Parliament in reference to the Government of India, and in order to provide for a more effective control over Indian questions, it is expedient to place the salary of the Secretary of State for India on the Estimates," said he welcomed the right hon. Gentleman as their greatest convert to State Socialism ; what he had said about State railways and forests fell like refreshing balm on the Labour benches. He regretted that no reference had been made in the statement to an amendment of the system of popular education in India. Remembering the quality of the work produced by Indian workmen in the past, it was a serious reflection upon our methods of administration and our system of government that we were now required to give the people technical instruction to enable them to produce the goods upon which they had to rely for a living. He hoped the reduction of the salt tax would be generous, and that soon the right hon. Gentleman and his advisers would see their way to remove it altogether. He entirely agreed that this country had become more concerned with Asiatic affairs than European, and it was for that reason that he desired to lay special emphasis upon the Amendment he was about to move. If we were to be more an Asiatic Power, it became deeply important that our relations with the people of India should be of the most friendly and cordial character. If we had a discontented India or an imbroglio arose in the East, the situation would be very dangerous. He was greatly disappointed at the *non possumus* attitude of the right hon. Gentleman towards his Motion. In his opinion it could do no harm to Indian affairs if they were discussed in this House. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State said, however, that they must not discuss Indian affairs because they did not understand them.

*Mr. MORLEY : I did not say that.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said that if that attitude was taken up the sooner the people of India controlled their own affairs the better.

*Mr. MORLEY pointed out that what he had said was that the discussion of Indian affairs from a Party point of view would not do any good, and that, moreover, there was a difficulty about time, although a lenient Government might find some for the discussion of particular subjects.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said everyone was aware of the difficulty of finding an opportunity for discussing even the ordinary affairs of India. He regretted that the administration of Indian affairs was still reserved, especially in the higher offices, to gentlemen from this country. The native races were excluded from the higher offices in the government of their own country because of the desire of educated English classes to keep India as a preserve for their own sons. The right hon. Gentleman had made considerable reference to the prosperity of the people of India, but there were facts even more conclusive than the appearance of copper pots, sewing machines, and other things in the houses when they came really to test the social condition of the people of the country. According to Lord Curzon the average income of the people of India from the highest paid official of the Government down to the poorest ryot in the land was £2 a head, and the average taxation was 3s. 6d. per head. That did not show that there was a very abundant prosperity in India. The death rate was increasing rapidly ; that also was strong presumptive evidence of great poverty on the part of the people. During the past forty years there had been ten famines, in the course of which 15,000,000 people had died. The average death rate for the ten years ending 1884 was twenty-four per 1,000. In 1894 it was thirty per 1,000 ; in 1904 it had reached thirty-two per 1,000. He submitted that from those figures alone they had more evidence of the social condition of India than they could get from any other source. In the cases of famine again there was increased evidence of the poverty of the people. The famines now increased in violence. In other years the people had their rice, and they had their silver trinkets and other things to fall back upon and from the produce of which they might feed themselves. They had those things no longer, and died of hunger where otherwise they might have lived.

According to the report of the Famine Commissioners it was admitted that the increased poverty of the people was responsible for the higher death rate during the time of famine. It was pointed out in Mr. W. S. Lily's great work "India and its Problems," that the struggle of the Indian people was not to live human lives but to live at all; that it might be said that in India, except in the irrigated districts, famine was chronic—endemic. He hoped in view of these facts the consensus of opinion in this House would be that it should have a more direct and effective control over the affairs of India than it possessed at the present moment. There were two methods by which the loyalty in India might be preserved and the condition of its people ameliorated. One was by giving educated Indians a larger share in the administration of Indian affairs. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should make a start in that direction by appointing some educated natives on the council of the Secretary for India, which at present did not contain a single native. He also thought it was imperative that there should be some State supervision of the conditions of employment in the textile factories of India. The capital engaged in that industry was somewhere about £11,000,000, operating 200 mills with 5,000,000 spindles and 50,000 looms. The product of those mills was bound to be an increasing product and to come into increased competition with goods produced at home; therefore it was better from the point of view of the home industry that the condition of the Indians who were there employed should not be such as to give an unfair advantage to the mill owners. The manufacturer in India had the advantage over the manufacturer in this country of lower wages. It was wrong that he should also have the advantage of long hours—in some cases from 5 o'clock in the morning until 8 in the evening—and freedom from the wise restraint imposed by factory legislation on manufacturers in this country. The motto of the political Party with which he was associated was —Treat the different parts of the Empire with justice and consideration and thus induce loyalty and contentment among their peoples. He begged to move the Motion standing in his name.

*MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) congratulated the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India upon the most interesting statements he had made. He had not time to refer to the more important points, but he was glad to hear as his right hon. friend developed his speech one sentence which was full of hope, a sentence which had given him (Mr. Roberts) and those who thought with him on Indian matters very great satisfaction. In that sentence, which dealt with the future policy, the right hon. Gentleman said we had now reached a stage when it would be wise to advance some paces further towards the improvement of the Indian Government. He was convinced that the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to the letter and spirit of that important declaration. Dealing with the particular Motion before the House he might say that this was not a new question. The obvious object of the suggestion made in the Motion was to give the House of Commons further opportunity for discussing Indian finance. In his judgment one of the first if not the essential steps in the direction of Indian reform was to revive the interest and deepen the sense of responsibility of the British Parliament with regard to the Indian Empire. As to the suggestion that the salary of the Secretary of State should be borne upon the Estimates, as his right hon. friend knew, the question was not a question of money or of personality. It had not the slightest reference to the fact that he held this important position himself. It was simply a statement of policy and principle. He could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman that th effect of adopting this Amendmen would be to bring India within th purview of Party politics at home He had always considered that Indian questions should be kept outside Party politics; at the same time he thought a far greater interest should be taken in India in the House. He would mention the close analogy of our self-governing Colonies. The salary of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the expenses of that Department were all borne on the Estimates. Let them contrast for a moment the interest of India with the interest of any of our self-governing Colonies. The trade of India with this country was twice or three times as valuable as the trade of our self-governing Colonies, and if they took population the two cases could not be compared. He mentioned these facts merely to show that if it was wise and proper that the salary for the Secretary for the Colonies should be borne upon the Estimates how much more so it was in the case of India? The only thing was that in regard to India the case was more urgent, because, while the Colonies had self-government, India had not. The first reform in this matter was to bring the mind of Parliament into closer touch with the affairs of India. Lord George Hamilton some years ago said that the only practical result of placing the Secretary of State's salary on the Estimates would be that the British taxpayers would have to pay so many thousands more a year for the sake of having to discuss this matter. But that was not the question. The question was whether by the present arrangements they were doing justice to India; whether they were doing their duty as Members of this Assembly which was, after all, the ultimate authority in the Government of India. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the necessity of improving the Government of India, and recognised that there was a new situation in India which had to be met. He (Mr. Roberts) thought the most pressing question at the present moment was the necessity of associating the people more closely with the government of their country. He thought that was the most pressing question—because it lay at the root of all other reforms. If he might sum up in a few words the desires and aspirations of the educated people of India, he would say that what was desired was that there should be, upon the executive and legislative Councils of India, that Indian representation which would enable the Indian point of view to be stated in the Council of the Secretary of State, and in the executive and legislative bodies in India, and in his judgment something must be done without delay in this direction. They must remember the special circumstances of the position of India to-day. They must recollect that the policy pursued for the last few years and some of the legislation enacted had had the effect, rightly or wrongly, of shaking the confidence of India in her desire to proceed along the lines always laid down by us at the outset of our rule in India. Then there was also the fact that there had been special difficulty in Bengal. He was not going into that now, but the facts in regard to the administration of the government of Bengal had aggravated the situation. Then there was the remarkable triumph of Japan, and the beginnings of self-government which were to be seen at many points in the Eastern world. The great danger they had to face was the danger lest the Party of constitutional agitation in India, by too long delay on the part of His Majesty's Government in moving forward in the desired direction, should be discredited, and that forces should be let loose in India which might in the future create a situation of political danger. He did not think it was necessary for him to appeal to the Secretary of State for India to do all that he could to keep the heart of India true to British rule. The great thing was to convince the people of India that we were determined to move onward in the right direction. We might have to go slowly for many years, but so long as the ship of State in India moved in the direction of reform he for one was not a pessimist in the matter, for he believed we were, in association with the Indian people, destined to achieve in the future the great end of our government of India. He desired to second the Resolution.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'in view of the responsibility of Parliament in reference to the Government of India, and in order to provide for a more effective control over Indian questions, it is expedient to place the salary of the Secretary of State for India on the Estimates'—(*Mr. Keir Hardie*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) supported the Amendment on the ground that it might be the means of getting the high telegraphic charges from England to India reduced from 2s. to 1s. per word. Cheap and easy telegraphic communication with India was of immense importance to the trade of the country, and he thought that if the Amendment were carried the House would be able to carry out this reform in a short time. At present the charge for telegrams to India by 4,500 miles of land line was the same as the charge by cable for 10,000 miles. The cost of cable construction to India was from £200 to £400 per mile, whereas the cost of land line construction was only from £25 to £40 per mile. Anyone with common-sense could see that it ought to be far cheaper to send a wire to India by land line than by cable. But what was the difficulty? The Eastern Telegraph Company had made a joint purse with the Indo-European Land Line Company, and the result was the fixing of a prohibitive rate for ordinary messages. It was possible to telegraph to the head of the Persian Gulf, within sight of India, for 6½d. per word; from St. Petersburg to Vladivostock (a distance of 6,000 miles) for 4½d. per word; and from here to Australia for 2s. 6d. a word. Some years ago when fighting this great battle of cheap telegraphic and postal communication to every part of the British Empire a great meeting was held in one of the committee rooms of this House. At the head of the movement was the hon. Member for Hythe, and as the result of a great deal of trouble on the part of his hon. friend they got the rate to India reduced from 4s. to 2s. per word. That was a great concession on the part of the cable company, but they were still not satisfied, because they found that the evil was so great that social messages to and from India were almost impossible. It might surprise hon. Members to know that out of every 200 messages to India only one was sent for social reasons. If the rate to India were reduced to 6d. a word, by next Christmas at least 50,000 messages of greeting and goodwill would be sent from our soldiers, sailors, and mercantile classes to the old folks at home. The people here were subjected to these heavy penalties by a monopoly of cable and land line companies, and if this Amendment were carried the House could bring pressure to bear on the Secretary of State to appoint a Committee of business men to consider the subject. He therefore supported the Amendment.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that he disagreed with the Amendment and intended to vote against it. He had heard with great satisfaction what the Secretary for India said as to the further employment of Indians in the public service, for he had always been a strong supporter of this policy, especially but not solely in respect of judicial duties. He sincerely hoped the action of the Viceroy would lead to a more extended employment of our very capable and admirable fellow-subjects in India. He had also listened with unmixed satisfaction to the statement about the native Princes, for he had always keenly felt that the restraints placed upon them went beyond the necessities of the case. Moreover, by imposing upon these native Princes an administration of a uniformly British pattern, we destroyed the individuality, the thoroughly Indian and Oriental type, of the government of the State and impaired its most precious possession, its individuality. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman in his communications with the Indian Government would request them to lose no opportunity of impressing upon the provincial governments and officials the desirability of as full independence being given to these Princes as was permissible under their treaty or other engagements. He submitted that this was an exceedingly important matter, and that by allowing the native Princes more latitude in choosing their own ministers the Government would be doing much to confirm that native loyalty which, however, hardly needed confirmation. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had described the public service in India as the preserve of the middle classes. He had heard the middle classes defined as those immediately below the person who used the expression. Whatever they were he could assure the House that there was no means of getting into the service in India except by passing the examination held by the Government, which was the same as that prescribed for the Home services. The hon. Member who had talked about the members of English families being pitch-forked into the

Government service in India, spoke entirely without knowledge. Then the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had referred to the death-rate of India. It was, allowing for the difference in this behalf between East and West, a good rate, and, as one might say, very much the same as that of London. If there was in appearance a slightly progressive death-rate, it was because there was no registration in past times, and registration was improving every year. The hon. Member had spoken of the increase of famine. That was contrary to the fact. It was not understood that the large numbers returned as in receipt of famine relief were people not suffering, but saved from, famine. In the height of the greatest famine there was in receipt of outdoor relief a smaller proportion of the population than the normal proportion in this country. It was painful and deplorable that, while the Government were fighting against natural forces with extraordinary success, their very success should, through a misapprehension of the import of the figures, be made a reproach to them. Unless hon. Members believed that the Blue-books and Reports were mere concoctions, they must believe that the finances of the Government of India had been eminently successful. Indeed Lord St. Aldwyn had said in the House that the Finances of India were better managed, and in a better condition than those in England. The long list of Amendments on the Paper would lead one to believe that the House was dealing, not with the Government of India, but with the Government of the Congo. One hon. Member had said that no Government could be good which was not self-governing. That might be excellent as a principle, but the history of the world supported exactly the opposite doctrine. Only a small portion of the world was self-governing, and in dealing with administrative matters there was some advantage in dealing with them from a practical and not from an ideal point of view. He was not at all sure that the placing of the salary of the Secretary of State for India upon the Estimates would at all improve matters, for they got an opportunity for discussing Indian affairs now because of an arrangement made by the India Office, which was not bound to discuss the Estimates, but, to give the House a chance, arranged for a day's discussion. He felt sure, however, that the acceptance of this Motion would mean that England would have to pay a large sum for the support of the India Office, and it would only give them in the end exactly that one day for discussing Indian affairs which they now had. The British taxpayer would be a little more out of pocket, and that would be the net result; it would not give the House even an extra five minutes for the discussion of the affairs of India. He objected however to this Motion because of the exceeding great danger of bringing Indian affairs into English Party politics. Of late a strong effort had been made to represent the Liberal Party as the Party chiefly interested in India, and Members of that Party, and of a section of that Party, as those specially, if not exclusively, interested in India. Any such theory must be as fatal to the Liberal Party as to India. When the opium question was being discussed the hon. Member for Nottingham East, under the influence of that "drowsy syrup of the East," seemed to have dreamed a dream. He undertook to tell the House what the multitudinous inhabitants of India and China thought of the opium question. He dreamed that he was Member, not for "Nottingham East," but for "Nottingham and the East." The hon. Member had said, as *The Times* recorded, that the people of India "were trembling with expectation of what this new Parliament would do for the realisation of their wishes." That was the sort of thing against which he protested as fatal to our rule in India. How was the Government of India to be carried on if it were accepted that a change of Ministers in this country involved a change in the policy of the Viceroy and all the officials in India? It was Lord Cross, a Conservative Minister, who gave the very reform on which the Secretary of State was building to-day! Our statesmen hitherto had been too patriotic and too honourable to treat India as the plaything of Party. All the opinions which had been given to the House as opinions of the people of India came from Bengal only. He had no particular objection to Bengal opinion, but the other races in India had. They would not stand the domination of Bengal. They described it as the preference of the men of faction to the men of action; of the writers to the fighters. There was no one country, India, and there was no such people as "the Indians." The fact was not grasped here that representative institutions had never been desired by the inhabitants of India. Such a system would be regarded by them as putting the masses under the heel of the educated classes. There was no proof that any of the things asked for were desired. Only one man in ten in India could read, and only one woman in 144 could read, and under those circumstances what colossal audacity it was for anyone to get up and say in this House that he represented "the people of India." Some 150 hon. Members were stated in the Indian Press to have determined to free India from oppression, under which it seemed she laboured, and particularly to redress the grievance of the division of Bengal. He had seen Bengal treated as if any particular Committee was competent to carve it into pieces at pleasure. Were they to take no account of the opinion of the Government of India in that matter, and give them no chance of dealing with such difficult questions as that? Party agitation in England was discounted and accusations not taken too literally when made against political opponents, but that fact was not understood in India. He would quote a short statement by one of the greatest Indian statesmen. Sir T. Madhava Row said—

> "The longer one lives, observes and thinks, the more deeply does he feel that there is no community on the face of the earth which suffers less from political evils and more from self-inflicted or self-accepted or self-created and, therefore, avoidable evils, than the Hindu community."

This is what an ex-Minister of two great native states thought of the oppressive Government of India. It was perfectly true that when hon. gentleman like Messrs. Gokhale and Dutt came over here their speeches were most moderate and admirable, but it must be remembered that their moderation was not to be taken as typical of what was said in India. The statements made there with regard to British rule were deplorable, and he believed were highly prejudicial to the legitimate aspirations of moderate and loyal Indians. He was bound to say that those who made such statements misrepresented the actual facts of the case. For instance, Mr. Gokhale had recently said that the welfare of India was subordinated to the selfish interests of Europeans. He doubted whether that gentleman himself believed the statement. He regarded it as a little rhetorical flourish, but when retired members of the Indian Civil Service wrote from London out to India and said "Agitate," how did their case stand? These gentlemen were certainly not entitled to indulge in rhetorical flourishes at the expense of their fellow-countrymen. An Indian stockbroker, Mr. Shapurji Braocha, a very able man, had recently made a speech showing that in the opinion of bankers, merchants, and tradesmen India was rapidly advancing in prosperity; that such poverty as existed was a result of the thousands of years which preceded British rule, and that such unrest as existed was to be accounted for by the growing virulence and violence of congress literature. During the South African War a good deal was heard about the manipulation of the Press, but he would read something which appeared to him to show that the manipulation of the Press was not confined to South Africa. The following appeared in an Indian paper:—

> "The writer of the *Daily News'* London letter says:—'I hear that 150 M.P.s. have joined the new Indian Committee, this is very gratifying. The Indian question is becoming extremely grave, and a strong policy is needed to restore confidence in British administration. This can only come from an interested and instructed sentiment in Parliament.'"

Was all confidence in England lost in India, and where and what was the proof of the allegation? Then were those who set out to represent Bengal duly accredited? The following paragraph was from one of the chief native papers in Bengal—

> "We are, of course, deeply grateful to Sir Henry Cotton and other friends for all that they have done in this connection; but, we trust, they made it quite plain that the movement in Parliament was initiated without the knowledge of the leaders in Bengal. That this was really the case would appear from a suggestion of Sir Henry. It was to the effect that Assam should be included in Bengal, and a new province created westward with a capital at Patna. It may be

remembered that, when Sir Henry Cotton suggested something like this at the Calcutta Town Hall meeting it was objected to. As a matter of fact, there is a vast number of people in Bengal and Behar who are very much opposed to the separation of Behar from Bengal. We submit, therefore, that Sir Henry might have avoided such a proposal."

Again, when this anti-partition movement was regarded as so very serious as to be shaking India at the present moment, he would like to read a paragraph from one of the chief Bengali papers in regard to the arrest of Sarendra Nath Baunerjee, the editor of the *Bengali.* The editor of the *Patrika* was not arrested and the *Patrika* writes—

> "Now, this is selfish on the part of Babu Surendranath. When they had all gone prepared to enter jail he had no right selfishly to go alone and take all the glory to himself. Indeed, is it possible that he bribed the police to arrest him alone? Or else why, when Babu Mati Lal Ghose and others offered themselves to be similarly arrested, the Police in a most partial manner, refused to do it and deprived others a share in the glory!"

Babu Mati Lal was the editor of the *Patrika.* He really thought that was enough on the partition of Bengal. He did not dispute the fact that the educated and richer classes regretted very much to be cut off from Calcutta, and he sympathised with them, but there were many things to be said on the other side, such as the necessity for developing Assam and Chittagong and the Assam Railway, and giving the whole attention of a Lieutenant-Governor. Passing to another subject, there was very great need that the Government of India should take steps to increase the supply of well-packed, unadulterated cotton, because one of the greatest of our industries here at home depended upon it, and there was an intimate connection between the prosperity of India and the prosperity of England. He wished to bring home to hon. Members the fact that we should be infinite losers by any disturbance of the trade in India. Other new fields for cotton were proving rather a disappointment and it would suit us better to get our raw material from India than from other quarters. He was well aware that the Government of India had devoted and was devoting much attention to the subject. He wished to ask the Secretary of State to use his influence with the Secretary for the Colonies to see that the duty which kept Indian tea out of Ceylon should be abated. He expressed his profound disagreement with the hon. Member for Tyneside, who had said that as Russia was wiped out we might take no account of that country in connection with our Army arrangements in India. We had to count with a disturbed and distracted Russia, and war abroad and adventure were not incompatible with revolution at home. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would kindly bring pressure to bear on the Colonial Office in regard to the inequalities under which British Indian subjects suffered in the Transvaal and South Africa in general. The conduct of the British Indian subjects in South Africa, both during the war and after, had been most admirable; and, although they had been treated most injuriously, they had none the less just now offered to assist in putting down the rebellion in Natal, with men, and with money. That constituted an additional claim to sympathetic consideration at the hands of the Colonial Office. He knew, however, the difficulties with which this subject bristled, and no more wished to see our South African Colonies coerced from home than he wished to see India governed by alternate parties in the British Parliament.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside) said he need hardly assure the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India that any criticism which he would make had no personal application. He only wished to express the principles which he held. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had opposed the Amendment before the House. If the right hon. Gentleman was a servant of the Indian Government, why was he in this House? If he was a servant of England, why did not England pay his salary? The principle of this matter had been settled long ago. The salary of the Secretary for the Colonies had been paid by England simply because the Colonies would not pay it, and the salary of the Secretary for India was put upon India simply because we knew we could make India pay it. The position of the right hon. Gentleman was entirely anomalous, because he ought to be under the control of this House, and that was one of the reasons why he and his friends supported the Amendment, which had been opposed by the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs who so amiably represented Toryism on the Liberal benches! The right hon. Gentleman had given the House a rose-coloured picture of the condition of India, and had presented figures and statistics to shew that there had been an improvement in the revenue received from the State railways, canals, and forests. But the right hon. Gentleman did not deal with the high death rate, which had risen steadily for twenty years, was still thirty-two per 1,000, and in some rural districts much higher. Then there was the other question that the crop area was decreasing, and that the yield per acre was also decreasing. This had been repeatedly affirmed by Mr. Gokhale in the Budget discussions of the Viceroy's Council, and had not been denied. These facts pointed to decadence, which, if not arrested, would certainly partake of the nature of ruin before many years were over. There had been a boast about irrigation, but those acquainted with the facts were aware that the British Government had for more than 100 years allowed the ancient irrigation tanks to go to ruin. Only within the last twenty years had the Indian Government, with all their immense scientific resources, advanced seriously upon the irrigation works of the old native Princes. Then the taxation of India was unduly heavy. The salt tax was still 1,200 per cent. of the cost price. That was a blemish on British finance and administration. The right hon. Gentleman had called attention to the figures as to exports and imports. But surely the right hon. Gentleman admitted that the wealth of a country was to be measured more by its imports than by its exports; and the figures showed an enormous annual drain of the wealth of India. The imports were still £40,000,000 below the exports. His right hon. friend had said that the finances of India were well managed. He begged respectfully to contradict that proposition. The surpluses of revenue over expenditure were used, not so much to promote the welfare of the people and to better their condition, as to prepare for further military expenditure. He agreed that in many respects the productive expenditure of India was well laid out, but much of it could be carried on from borrowed money in such a way that the total pressure of the system on the people would be greatly lessened, and the surpluses should be directed, not to further military expansion, but to relieving the people from the burdens which pressed upon them. At the present time the sums spent upon education in India were derisorily insufficient and were not well applied. If the Government could not show that they were improving the minds or keeping in good health the bodies of the people of India their policy was not justified. His hon. friend the Member for Montgomery Burghs had misquoted him in regard to Russia. He had never said that Russia was wiped out, but Russia, as a foe to us in India, was not seriously to be considered for a number of years to come, yet it was at this very moment that the Government of India proposed an enormous increase of military expenditure. He regretted that, in dealing with the aspirations of the people of India for a larger measure of government, the Secretary of State thought it necessary to utter language of contempt with regard to claims that had never been made, and did not address himself to the proposals that had been made. We were accustomed to boast of the great things that we, a great European Power, had done in governing the peoples of India. Would the gentlemen at the India Office compare our government of India with the government of China?—That was a fair test. In China, the land tax, drawn from a far larger population, was considerably smaller than the amount that was drawn from the population of India, and the salt tax until the other day, pressed much less heavily on the people of China than did the same tax on the people of India. If we could not show that we governed India better than the Chinese governed China, the period of boasting might end until we had done something more worthy of it.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) thought the speech to which the

House had just listened, able as it was, had fully answered the remark of his right hon. friend that during the course of the debate the pessimistic view of the Government of India would be brought fully before the House. He thought his hon. friend had made the most pessimistic speech he had ever heard in that House on Indian affairs, and he did not think the evidence which he produced in support of his allegations and beliefs was justified by the facts. He should like to correct one or two errors with reference to both the finance and the government of India. First of all, what was the taxation? His hon. friend had spoken of India as the most overtaxed country in the world, and of the people being ground down to the verge of ruin by this heavy taxation. The present Administration were not called upon to defend the action of the late Government; but he was bound to say—and he said it with the greatest possible pleasure—that taxation in India during the past few years had been constantly decreasing. At this moment the taxation was less than ever it was before, and it bore less oppressively on the people than the taxation of any other country of which they could obtain any record or statistics. He would go still further, and say that there was no Government in the world which had tried to do more for the great population committed to its charge than the British Government had in India. He thought the House should know the facts in reference to the position of his right hon. friend at the India Office. It had been represented again and again that the Secretary of State was a mere tool, that he had no independence of his own, that he had no power, and that he was entirely under the control of the Government of India. He would recommend those who held that view to devote the first five minutes they had to spare to reading the Act on which the Government of India was based. They would find that the power of the Secretary of State, except in finance, was supreme and final; that where he and his Council differed his voice prevailed over the whole Council; that where he and the Indian Government differed, the voice of the Secretary of State prevailed over the Government of India and over the Viceroy. And it was because of the enormous power and responsibility of the office, which was the virtual appointment of a majority of this House, that he had always been very anxious to keep the Government of India, as far as possible, out of the arena of Party politics. What was the the taxation of India? He admitted that the salt tax was an oppressive tax. He had on many occasions advocated its total abolition. He did not think a tax on the prime necessity of life was a tax which, as the noble Lord opposite seemed to think, should be kept in reserve, like the income-tax here, for some special emergency, though he knew that that was an opinion held by a great many authorities on Indian finance. But what had been our experience? The salt tax had been reduced three times, and it was now, as his right hon. friend had stated in answer to a Question, equivalent to a farthing per pound of salt.

*Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: 1,200 per cent. of its value.

Sir HENRY FOWLER said that was an interesting arithmetical calculation, but what was more important was the actual amount. What was the annual pressure on the Indian taxpayer? The taxation on the people of India last year was 1s. 10½d. per head per annum. Was there any man who could point to a country where the taxation per head was less than that?

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: Does that include the land tax?

Sir HENRY FOWLER: There is no land tax.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Oh!

Sir HENRY FOWLER repeated that there was no land tax. He would recommend the hon. Member to read John Stuart Mill and Mr. Fawcett. The land revenue stood on precisely the same footing as the rent of land in this country. In the constitution of India for centuries the land had belonged to the Crown.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said he understood the Secretary for India to say that the taxation was 3s. 6d. per head.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said that was including the land revenue. The taxation of India was 1s. 10d.; it had nothing to do with the land revenue. Lord Cornwallis, when Governor-General of India, believed it would be a great advantage to the Government of India to create a landed aristocracy similar to that in this country, and he therefore created a settlement by which rents were fixed in perpetuity. That, of course, created sub-tenants, sub-ownerships, and a class of peasant occupants who were not proprietors of the land. Legislation had to be dealt with to try and remedy the evils of the Cornwallis settlement. The net loss to the people of India by the Bengal settlement was now estimated at many millions. But the present tenure of land in India, excluding Bengal, was a just tenure. The rents were fixed once in thirty years, having regard to the intrinsic value of the soil and the value of the products of the soil, and a very small proportion was charged upon the land. That could not be called taxation in any shape or form; it resembled the relation of landlord and tenant. In one respect it was unique, that when bad times came there were annual remissions of those rents. It was by the addition of this rent that the figure of 3s. 5d. in the £ was arrived at. The test which had been applied with reference to the progress or deterioration of India was a mere supposition. [AN HON. MEMBER: The death-rate.] He thought they had heard enough about the death-rate to show the utter inadequacy of the argument. There were plagues and wild beasts in India, and other causes of death which did not exist here. On the statistics we had now we might rely to some extent, but not on those of twenty or thirty years ago. But we could compare the Government and administration of India under the rule of Great Britain with what it was before British rule prevailed, and we had reason to congratulate ourselves on that comparison. Not in 150 years, but in a much shorter time, since the day when Burke suggested in a celebrated passage that if English rule were wiped out, there would not be a trace left behind of any great work performed in the interests of the people, we had laboured in India and raised there one of the brightest monuments of English rule in any part of the world. The hon. Member for Tyneside had spoken of the people as if they were one nation; he might as well talk of Europe as one nation.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON said he had spoken of India as composed of many peoples, but had said that it was unwise to set one against the other.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said that that had never been done. They must remember that in India they could not have that unity and similarity which existed in all the other great Empires in the world—there were fifty different languages in India, many different races, religions, creeds, and standards of social and political life. The hon. Gentleman seemed to think it was a very awful thing to imply to that the Bengali wer e not as good soldiers as the Sikhs. He was reminded of the saying of a great Indian Rajah with reference to this difference, which the Rajah thought the British people did not fully understand. He said:—"British rule perhaps, Bengali never." As to the feeling between the different races of India, they knew what that would be if there was any relaxation of the *pax Britannica*. It was the power of England which really kept India together in peace, promoted its prosperity, developed its industries, taught the great moral truths, justice, and equality before the law, and was gradually raising the rank of women in India to an extent which they would find it very difficult to parallel in the history of any nation of the world in ancient or modern times. The hon. Member for Merthyr had alluded to the condition of our Indian railways. Where had the money come from for that great system of railways in India? To a great extent it had been English money. There was no heavy drain of Indian resources, the drain was on English capital, by which the railways had been constructed, and that having been done under our management, there was a net gain to the people of India of over

£2,000,000 a year, and this revenue was daily increasing. On the Amendment before the House they were told that to place the salary of the Secretary of State on the Estimates would give a greater opportunity for the discussion of Indian affairs—not for asking questions, that was fully in force at present. How and when would this opportunity be given? At this moment the House was over-burdened, it could not deal with what it had on its shoulders. They had not yet discussed the Votes for the Board of Trade or the Treasury. Unless there was a complete change in the character and procedure of this House which had never yet been contemplated, how was it to undertake to manage India? If they sat every day for a year they could not do the work. They had a most effective Parliamentary control over questions of principle, which was outside Party politics. He knew of no questions that were more fully and ably discussed in the House than large questions of Indian policy. His right hon. friend had made a most eloquent and admirable speech, but when it was contended that these matters could be better discussed if the salary of the Secretary of State was put upon the Estimates he said that that was not true, because whenever great questions of policy had arisen in this House it had always been able to discuss them, and he knew of no questions that were more fully and ably discussed in the House than large questions of Indian policy. But the House refused to interest itself in petty Indian squabbles, which might very well be left for settlement outside. There must be some devolution, and when he knew what the Government of India was, that in India the Viceroy had a Cabinet with great statesmen in control of every department—finance, agriculture, foreign affairs and political affairs—and when he knew that at home there was a Council composed of the men who had spent the greater portion of their lives in India, and who continued to give their time and ability to the impartial consideration of its affairs, he was the more satisfied and the more convinced that a better and more efficient system could not be devised. There was another reason why he was opposed to the Amendment. He dreaded the introduction of Party politics into Indian affairs. He believed a strong Opposition, whether composed of Liberals or hon. Gentlemen opposite, would always, if they could do it, strike a popular Minister down. But the House had always agreed to keep Indian affairs outside the controversies of Party. He remembered in his own experience that when a great Indian question had arisen, when the existence of the Government was threatened, when the Government was told even by their sanguine Whip that they would be defeated in the Lobbies, the Party in Opposition, though by no means anxious to keep the Government in office, rose to the occasion and made the interests of India supreme. He hoped the House would continue to keep Indian questions still outside the Party arena, and still regard the benefit of the people of India and the progress of India as the sole considerations to guide it in its decisions on Indian affairs.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 153; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 242.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. HnSir AlexF.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r H'mlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duckworth, James
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, J.H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Foster, Rt. Hn. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Gordon,SirW.Evans-(T'rHam.
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Jardine, Sir J.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Laidlaw, Robert

Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson,CharlesN(Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Sir Charles Mark
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Percy, Earl
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampt'n
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.

Renton, Major Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spicer, Sir Albert
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thornton, Percy M.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward,WDudley(Southampton
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Barnes, G. N.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt.Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Channing, Francis Allston
Cogan, Denis J.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flynn, James Christopher
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard

Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Law, Hugh A.(Donegal, W.)
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
Maddison, Frederick
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.

O'Hare, Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Sullivan, Donal
Sutherland, J. E.
Thorne, William
Verney, F. W.
Wardle, George J.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, P. W. (St.Pancras,S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. John Robertson.

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Sir C. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) said though they had just been to a division he might be allowed to allude to a question that had been before the House previously.

***Mr. SPEAKER** said he did not think the hon. Gentleman was entitled to go back to that. The object of the division had been to free the debate for the discussion of other matters.

Sir C. SCHWANN said in that case he would refer only to the question of education. The Secretary of State for India, he thought, would allow that the progress of elementary education in India was really a failure and one of which the Government of India must feel heartily ashamed. The House had been accustomed to a consistent and persistent *non possumus* from the Treasury Bench in regard to matters relating to India, but his right hon. friend the Member for Montrose was influenced by a new spirit. The spirit which animated his right hon. friend the Member for Wolverhampton was totally changed. During the time that the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton occupied the position of Secretary of State for India he gave them no amelioration of any kind, but since the right hon. Member for Montrose had been at the India Office he had—no doubt by using arguments to the Viceroy—increased the representation of the native element on the Council. During the whole period that the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton was in office there was little or no advance, but now progress was easier and they seemed to be at the beginning of better times. The question of education was one in which the right hon. Member took a deep interest, and he was likely to do what he could to improve elementary education in India. With a view of impressing upon the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of causing considerable changes to be made, he would give some details as to the position of primary schools in India. According to the Government instructions the aim of the primary teaching in India was to impart reading and writing and such elementary knowledge as would enable a person to look after his own interest. That did not seem to be a very high aim, though no doubt it was sufficiently high for the necessities of the case, and, if achieved, would be an enormous step in advance. The latest statistics for 1905 showed that there was only one school in every five villages, while the education given was of a very rudimentary and poor class. There were 97,700 primary schools for boys and 8,000 for girls, and the scholars attending were 3,000,000 boys and 500,000 girls, or 3,500,000 out of a population of school age of 35,000,000, or one in ten. That was a highly undesirable state of affairs and one that ought not to be allowed to continue. There was also a deficiency of secondary schools, the number being 5,000 for boys and 500 for girls, while the scholars attending them were 600,000 boys and 48,000 girls. There was no reason why an effort should not be made to cause by various means a larger number of girls to receive education which would relieve the monotony of their lives and give them a wider outlook and larger resources. The colleges were also few in number, there being only 136 for young men and twelve for girls; there were forty-five professional colleges for medical, legal, and engineering students. The scholars in the art colleges numbered 18,400 young men, and 200 women, and in the professional colleges there were 6,000 young men and only eighty-one women. He trusted that a considerable improvement would be made along the educational line in India. Elementary education at least should be free and compulsory. When he said "compulsory" he did not suggest that that could be brought about all at once. The yearly expenditure on primary schools in India was only £700,000, and deducting £40,000 for the native States, there was only £660,000 for the whole of British India. That sum was obtained thus: from the State £90,000, from local boards and municipal funds £270,000, from fees, £200,000, and from subscriptions £100,000. As only £200,000 was provided by fees paid by pupils it did not seem possible for the Government of India to make the education free at once, especially as it would mean £2,000,000 if all the fees were paid.

Nobody could expect the Government to undertake the gigantic task of making education compulsory all over India, but he suggested that it might be possible as an experiment to apply the principle to the three Presidency towns, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. Such an experiment would not be costly. The education could best be worked through the municipalities, on which bodies there were many gentlemen of Indian birth who would be able to introduce any changes with much more delicacy in relation to caste than would probably be done by an English Governor. After three years it might be possible to extent this compulsory system to the smaller cities such as Lahore, Poona, and Allahabad. He hoped that the Government would give some promise that they meant to make some serious attempt to improve elementary education in India. He could not imagine that the Liberal principles which had always been professed by the Secretary and the Under-Secretary for India would allow such an important subject to be neglected. He apologised to the House for raising the education question again, because they had heard so much of it during the last six weeks, and it did seem rather hard that he should again refer to it. In Baroda the officials for the last twenty years had been pushing education forward, and in that State they had improved enormously their education methods. There the expenditure was 5½ annas per head as against 2 annas per head for India. He hoped the Secretary of State for India would take his courage in both hands in regard to the reforms he had mentioned, and he could assure him that if he did so he would find a large number of supporters in the House of Commons. He agreed with Burke that Members of Parliament should be jealous of executive power, and that was why he was so anxious that the affairs of India should be brought prominently before the House of Commons. He did not know why India should be the one sacred topic upon which no Englishman should be allowed to form an opinion, or why they should hand over the affairs of India to Anglo-Indian officials who came back from India with prejudices against their own country. It was their bounden duty to get all the information about India that they could obtain. He would advise hon. Members to pay a visit to India, because there were many questions which were easy to grasp and understand from investigations on the spot. He trusted that they were not going to have a Commission sent out like that which was sent to South Africa. Hon. Members themselves should form a Commission to go and see the conditions and the difficulties of Indian administration for themselves. He hoped that in the near future they should see an enormous advance made in the progress of the people of India, who were our fellow subjects, and upon whose affairs they ought to spend as much time as they could spare and devote to them the very best energies and intellectual power which this House could provide.

*SIR W. EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) congratulated the Secretary of State on the manner and the contents of his admirable speech. Reference had been made to the new spirit that was arising in India and the need for facing the change. Personally he had watched the administration of India for thirty years, and for more than twenty he had served in military and civil capacities there. During that time he had seen how the administration of India was modified in accordance with the social and political changes that were taking place in the country. The evolution in all branches of the Government of India had been concurrent with the political and social evolution which had taken place. The Secretary for India had referred in the concluding portion of his speech to the proclamation issued by Queen Victoria after the Mutiny, and made special reference to the qualifying words which that proclamation contained. The right hon. Gentleman said he did not believe that those who issued that proclamation ever intended the qualifying words to be used in a narrow sense. Well, he did not believe they had been construed in a narrow sense, but that they had been freely and fairly interpreted by the Government of India. Everything the Secretary of State for India had told the House connection to state what was probably quite unknown to the large majority of the Members of the House, namely, what the present position was as to the share which the natives of India had in the government and administration of that country. The number of Europeans who filled the higher judicial and executive posts amounted to only 1,000. All the lower judicial, revenue, and executive appointments were held by natives. At the present time the doors of the Civil Service were open to them, and the qualification to hold the higher civil appointments in India was the same for all, there being no distinction as to race or colour. The highest judicial appointment in Bengal was held by a native Bengalee; the Advocate-General was a Bengalee; and the Standing Council in more than one case were natives, while in every High Court of Justice native judges were on the Bench. From these facts it would be observed that the number of native Indians employed in all branches of the Civil Service was steadily increasing. For his part, he had no objection to the statement of the Secretary for India that this matter was to be further considered by the Viceroy's Council; but he asked that when they were considering the appointment of natives to the higher posts they should not be influenced so much by the loud cries of the very men who were going to get, or expected to get, these appointments; but by the effect which such appointments would have on the people generally. Every appointment in India should be based on the principle of what was most beneficial for the people as a whole. The hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, who spoke with great experience, had said that it was absurd to believe that there was any great demand by the people of India to be governed by themselves. What happened in the Native States? In the case of Hyderabad the head of every single Government Department was English. In 1902 an experiment was made by appointing a native as head of the Revenue Department, but in three months time the clamour against him was so great that he was replaced by an Englishman. He did not believe that the agitators connected with the movement in the Indian Congress really represented the people of India, or that if their schemes were carried out to-morrow the condition of the people would be improved. His own profound opinion was that there was nothing to fear from the loyalty to this country of the people of India, and that the Government could not do better than proceed calmly on the lines indicated by the Secretary of State.

*Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.) said he had listened to the attacks made upon him from both sides of the House, and would like to have replied on the general question, but he had decided with reference to the limited time available to confine his remarks to the subject of which he had given notice, viz., the large increase of military expenditure in India. This increase was principally due to the maintenance of the British Army in that country, for the cost of a British soldier there was four or five times more than that of a native soldier. He would take for his text the words uttered by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War two or three days ago when he said that the British force in India was not there to resist aggression on the part of any of the great Powers, but for the purpose of preserving internal order. That was a most important admission, never before made by a right hon. Gentleman in his highly responsible position. It had been commonly argued that the British force in India was for the protection of that country against invasion by Russia; but now they were told that the real reason for a British force in India was to serve the functions of a local militia, and to prevent insurrection. He welcomed that admission. The right hon. Gentleman went on to state that the size of the force was determined at the time of the Mutiny and that whether it was too small or too large that standard had not been departed from. The Secretary for War must have been sadly misinformed before he made that statement. He could find no authority for the statement that the standard of the British forces in India was fixed after the Mutiny. On the contrary it was a matter of notoriety that it was not fixed, but fluctuated very considerably. Before the Mutiny the strength of the European troops in India was about 37,000 men as against 230,000 native troops. What was then decided was that the British force and the native force should remain in the proportion of about one to two. That was to say that the native force should never be more than double the strength of the British troops. It was also laid down that the artillery should remain in the hands of the British soldiers. During the 'sixties, the strength of the British troops varied from 65,000 to 55,000. In the year he went to India the number was only 55,000. During the 'seventies it averaged 58,000. It was in 1873 that the late Lord Lawrence gave evidence before a Commission which considered the whole question of the strength of the British troops in India and he gloried in the fact that he had reduced the British force in India by 7,000 men. He was cross-examined and asked whether this strength would be sufficient to put down an insurrection, and he said that if we had 60,000 English soldiers and officers in India he did not think a dog would bark against us, but if an insurrection did occur it would be put down before it had spread at all. The standard as laid down by Lord Lawrence therefore was 60,000. That was also the standard adopted by the Commission appointed to inquire into the organisation and administration of the Indian Army in 1879. The present Lord Roberts, then Sir Frederick Roberts, was a member of that Commission, and concurred in its recommendation that it was not necessary to maintain the number of British troops in India beyond 61,000, and Lord Lytton, who was then the Viceroy, agreed to a standard of 62,000. Lord Ripon and the Home Government of the time accepted this as a maximum figure. In 1885 when Lord Ripon had left the country and Lord Dufferin was Viceroy, the number of British troops was as low as 55,000. Then occurred the Penjdeh incident, and in a moment of panic the number of British troops in India was increased by 10,000 with a corresponding increase of expenditure to India. Two members of the Viceroy's Executive Council at that time—Sir Auckland Colvin, the Finance Minister, and Sir Courtenay Ilbert, the Law Member —protested against that increase on the ground that it was unnecessary and would lead to grave responsibilities, but their advice was not listened to, and the number was allowed to increase until in the 'nineties the average number of troops in India was 73,000. Then came the Boer war. One effect of the Boer war was to draw troops from India. The Government of India was applied to and sent British troops to South Africa. The number of troops sent to South Africa, Somaliland, and China reduced the force in India to 63,000; that was four or five years ago. India was not the worse for it. On the contrary, India was better for it, because while the troops were thus employed, India had not to pay for them. To the great reduction of military expenditure which took place during 1900–1903 were largely due the surpluses of which they had heard so much this afternoon. That showed that the number of troops in India was larger than was necessary. In 1904 the number increased to 76,000, and in 1905 to 78,000, and the Secretary of State for War had informed them that the number for the present year was 79,446. That was a record. There was an increase, therefore, of some 16,000 men above the number that were in India four or five years ago. What was the reason for this increase? Why, if four or five years ago India was content with a force of 63,000 men, was it necessary at the present time to maintain 79,000? Why were the taxpayers of India to be burdened with this unnecessarily heavy expenditure, for the maintenance of British troops in the country? They were entitled to an answer from the right hon. Gentleman, and they were entitled also to more information in regard to the additional expenditure which was being incurred at the present moment. They had heard a good deal of rumour, but owing to the secretiveness of the India Office they knew little or nothing about what Lord Kitchener's scheme meant. What he desired to know was how the sum sanctioned was to be expended. The additional £2,000,000 on armaments he understood, but how was the £8,000,000 or £9,000,000 that the scheme was to cost to be expended? His information was that it was to be spent on re-organisation and re-distribution, on transferring the troops from the plains of India, where they were now serving, to the North-West Frontier and locating them on that frontier and even beyond it. That was a very serious thing.

*MR. MORLEY: That is wrong.

*SIR H. COTTON said he was very glad to hear the contradiction, but for his purpose the argument was the same. It cost a large sum to acquire land, construct barracks, and concentrate troops in a particular tract of country. It was to this purpose that this large sum of £9,000,000 was, he believed, to be devoted. He would be glad to have some information regarding that expenditure.

*MR. MORLEY said that at some future time he would be in a position to describe the whole situation.

*SIR H. COTTON said he was glad to hear it. At the present moment when there was no real danger whatever, when it was not alleged that our Army was maintained for the purpose of aggression, but merely for the maintenance of order in India, he could see no reason why it should be maintained on a scale of about 20,000 men beyond the figure which eminent authorities had considered to be the *maximum* required. He did not want to dwell upon the collapse of the Russian Army, because of the admission made by the Secretary of State for War that we did not maintain our Army in India to resist invasion, but for keeping order. Until Penjdeh nobody doubted that 60,000 British troops would be ample. Now we had nearly 80,000 men, and the cause of the increase was unexplained. Our real security in India, the real basis of order in that country, was not the Army we might maintain there, but the contentment of the people of India. If they were contented with our rule, if they were friendly towards us, if, indeed, the state of things in India only resembled the state of things when he first went to India nearly forty years ago, not only would it have been possible to reduce the number of troops, but——

MR. H. H. MARKS called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

House counted and forty Members being found present the debate was resumed.

*SIR H. COTTON, continuing, said he looked with very unfavourable eyes on the proposals for the concentration of troops on the frontier. At the time of the Mutiny there were 400 miles of railway in India; at the present moment there were nearly 30,000, and that made all the difference in the mobilisation of an Army. It had always been urged that as railways extended facilities for mobilisation increased. If that were so it followed that it would be possible to reduce the number of troops in India. Why had not effect been given to that argument, or, at any rate, why had not the case been considered from that point of view? As centralisation was necessary to meet a foreign enemy so dispersion was requisite for the maintenance of peace in a country which had been occupied. When the troops had been withdrawn from the bases at which they were stationed in the country, the argument would be raised that it was necessary to put an additional force in their place. The scheme on which we had embarked was a most dangerous one and might lead to a very large increase of the Indian Army. When that increase was applied for, it would be almost impossible to refuse it without undoing what was now being done in the matter of organisation and concentration. There was one remark he had to add on the general question. He wished the right hon. Gentleman had been able to make a statement which would give more satisfaction to the Indian people. Many portions of the Secretary of State's speech would no doubt give the greatest possible satisfaction, but it contained no pledges to action except in regard to the appointment of an official Commission, which was a very small matter indeed.

*MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.) said the Party with which he sat had been taunted with the fact that they cared very little about Empire, but they cared as much for the Empire as any Member of the House. There was one feature of the debate which had not been touched upon but with which he wished to deal. The Motion which he had down on the Paper dealt with four subjects, the chronic poverty of the people, the question of famine, and technical and primary education. It was said by hon. Members opposite that the condition of the people of India was not so dreadful as it was said to be; but the poverty of the people of India was simply chronic. That was a term that could not be applied to the condition of any other civilised people in the world. The average income of the people of India was £2 per head per annum. That showed a somewhat serious state of things, but there was a more startling figure still and one which was perhaps nearer the truth. Mr. W. Digby, a great Indian publicist, had made a calculation that the income of the people of India was about £1 per head per annum. On occasion they had had to grumble at the average income of the people of Great Britain, which amounted to £43 per head per annum. Hon. Members would see when they came to compare that with the £2 per head of the people of India that it certainly showed a state of chronic poverty, and while that state of things prevailed it could not be contended that the people were prosperous. Considering that they had not had much promise of anything being done by the present Secretary of State, they had a right to grumble and to urge that this matter should be inquired into. In spite of that chronic poverty, however, the people were taxed to the hilt. £30,000,000 per annum was taken out of the country for which there was no return, and beyond that they were taxed up to the eyes in order to keep a most expensive Army in existence. In 1884 the cost of the Army was £12,000,000, in 1906 it was £22,000,000. Believing as he did that 85 per cent. of the population of India had to find the bulk of that money, and considering what state they were in, he thought that the question was one for serious consideration by this House. Again, these poor poverty-stricken people paid £4,000,000 sterling per annum to Europeans in the shape of salaries. Respecting the present Army organisation in India, he wished to point out that the people of British India got no benefit from the Army, because the recruiting which used to take place in the country in which the stations were now took place over the frontier. He could not accept the statement that famine was becoming less frequent, for he found that eight out of the last ten years were years of famine. He supposed famine arose from the fact that the land was not cultivated scientifically, and he did not know that the Government had taken much trouble in spreading the knowledge of agriculture among the people. Let them take the great scheme of irrigation which was to help to make the land fertile. Whilst they found £21,000,000 spent on railways in the country, only £1,000,000 was spent on irrigation. With regard to the land, he understood that in Bengal there was a system of landlordism, an arrangement by which the landlords paid a fixed sum in perpetuity to the State. They had in India what we had not in this country, namely, the nationalisation of the land, and the people in other parts of India only asked that they should be treated by the Government land agents in the same manner as the tenants in Bengal were treated by their landlords. The basis upon which rents were fixed was four years of famine, four years of good harvest, and two years of ordinary harvest; but of the last ten years eight had been famine years, and the people were up to their eyes in debt to the money-lenders. The Government officials, too, came along to collect the rents at a most disadvantageous time of the year, when the crop had not yet been harvested. The poor ryot had to get the money from somewhere, and so fled to the money-lender, so that whether it was a year of famine or a year of good harvest the ryot was in the same position, because in a year of good harvest the money-lender was down on him and in a year of famine he had nothing whatever to go on with. The terrible increase in the death-rate was closely allied to the chronic poverty of India. It had gone up from twenty-four to thirty-five per 1,000 in twenty years. That was a position which the Government ought not to view with equanimity. They ought to do what they could to improve the situation in India and put an end to that state of things. Was it too much to say that the terrible death-rate with other causes was responsible for the decreasing population in Bombay and the central provinces? The population, instead of increasing at the rate of 10 per cent., which was the normal increase, had gone back by 5 per cent. which made a difference of 15 per cent. on the whole population. In Bengal the population only increased by 3 per cent. instead of 10 per cent. It was an astonishing thing to him that in India there was no attempt made to train the working people in industry, agriculture or the cultivation of cotton, tea, and coffee planting. With a single exception there was not a technical institution in India, that exception having been provided by the liberality of an American, although it was true that at the present time it had been taken over by the Government. A country must always be in this state of chronic poverty where the people were left in a state of ignorance respecting the principal industries of the country. Unless the land was tilled on scientific principles they could never get rid of the poverty and famine. The only way was to teach the people the scientific principles of agriculture. In the matter of agriculture, sugar and tea planting and coffee growing he submitted that the common people had no trained knowledge at all, and he suggested that the Secretary of State might take into consideration the question of establishing technological institutions throughout the country and in that way try to improve the condition of those concerned. Any scheme of technical education would of course necessarily involve a scheme of primary education. The state of elementary education in the country was in his judgment not only a disgrace to the Indian Government, but also to the people of Great Britain, who ought to bear the responsibility in these matters. At the present moment there were 18,000,000 boys of school age in India, only 3,268,726 of whom were attending school. He felt sure that as time went on the people of India would become alive to the fact that girls as well as boys should be educated. The astonishing fact was that there was only one school to five villages. Until he began to study the Blue-books he had no knowledge of the poverty and ignorance of the Indian people. Let it be said, however, to the credit of the leaders of the Indian people that they were deeply in earnest

Mr. O'Grady.

in this matter of primary education and were prepared to take upon themselves the duty of making compulsory education popular if the Government would only take action and say that the education should first of all be free. It would only mean that the Government would have to pay another £200,000. The request for compulsory education would follow, and that was estimated to involve a cost of not more than £5,000,000 at the outside. He submitted that the time had come, with the new spirit abroad and the growing feeling of the responsibilities of Empire in the true sense of the term, for this country to take up the matter. If the Secretary of State for India would take his courage in both hands and break through the iron-bound officialism of his Department his name would go down to posterity as the greatest Secretary of State India had ever had.

Mr. SECRETARY MORLEY rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. BILSON (Staffordshire, N.W.), in the Chair.]

Resolved, That it appears from the Accounts presented to Parliament that in 1904–5 the Revenue of India amounted to £84,812,971, the Expenditure charged against Revenue to £81,356,905, and the Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue to £6,258,195.—(*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

Resolution to be reported.

POST OFFICE (LITERATURE FOR THE BLIND) BILL.

Bill was read a Second Time, and committed for Monday next.

REVENUE (EXCISE DUTY, ETC.)

Resolutions reported—

1. "That there be charged, as from the sixth day of July, nineteen hundred and six, on a licence to be taken out annually by a manufacturer for sale of British wines, an excise duty of one pound."

"That a uniform duty of ten shillings be substituted for the stamp duties now chargeable on an Award in England or Ireland, and on an Award or Decreet Arbitral in Scotland."

3. "That it is expedient that the amount payable out of the Consolidated Fund under section three of The Bank Act, 1892, shall, as regards Treasury Bills, be at the rate of two hundred pounds for every million pounds of the maximum amount of Bills outstanding at any one time during the financial year, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other purposes connected with Finance."

Resolutions agreed to.

DEAN FOREST (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment (King's Consent signified); Bill read the third time, and passed.

LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS BILL.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) hoped the Government would not press this Bill, Clause 2 of which abolished the property qualification hitherto required for the Office of Land Tax Commissioner. It might be quite right to do it, but, it was an important point, and he hoped the Bill would not be pressed to-day.

*MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flintshire) said that if the hon. Gentleman would allow the Second Reading to be taken now, he would undertake that the Committee stage should be put off until October 23rd. As a matter of fact there was at the present moment no property qualification in seven of the counties of Wales, and all that was proposed in this Bill was to assimilate the practice in other parts of the country. Might he also remind the hon. Gentleman that the House of Lords had recently passed unanimously a Bill abolishing the property qualification in respect of justices of the peace.

SIR F. BANBURY said he would comply with the request of the hon. Gentleman, but he did not agree that they should always follow in this country what had been done in Wales, or that the House of Lords was wise in the action alluded to by the hon. Gentleman.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) hoped it would be understood that as some of them were very much interested in Clause 2, the Committee stage would be taken at a reasonable hour.

MR. J. H. LEWIS said another reason for postponing the Bill until the autumn was that it would enable hon. Members to receive and consider names from their own constituencies.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) asked whether anyone could say when the autumn session would begin.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey): October 23rd.

Bill read a third time, and committed for Tuesday October 23rd.

Ordered, That the Members for Counties do prepare lists of the Christian and Surnames of Commissioners for executing the Land Tax Acts for their respective Counties.

Ordered, That Members for Boroughs and Places having Commissioners exercising exclusive jurisdiction within the same under the said Acts do prepare similar lists of Commissioners for executing the said Acts within such Boroughs and Places respectively.

Ordered, That Members for other Boroughs and Places do prepare similar lists of Commissioners for executing the said Acts for the Counties in which such last-mentioned Boroughs and Places are situate—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July.

Adjourned at two minutes after Seven o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 3rd July, 1906.

The Right Hon. George John Shaw-Lefevre, having been created Baron Eversley of Old Ford, in the county of London—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Right Hon. William James Pirrie, having been created Baron Pirrie of the city of Belfast — Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir John Jones Jenkins, Knight, having been created Baron Glantawe of Swansea, in the county of Glamorgan—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

George Armitstead, Esquire, having been created Baron Armitstead of Castlehill, in the city of Dundee—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—Post Office Sites.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Todmorden Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill; Derby Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Portsmouth Water Bill [H.L.]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill; Watford Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders No. 7) Bill. House in Committee (according to order); Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION.

Petition to be allowed to continue to give Church of England teaching in schools; of teachers in non-provided schools in Framland, Peterboro; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION.

Petition against the abolition of the voluntary school system; of inhabitants of Kirkham, Lancaster; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATAL.

Further correspondence relating to native disturbances in Natal (in continuation of [Cd. 2905.], May, 1906).

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Further correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony (in continuation of [Cd. 2563.], July, 1905).

BRITISH GUIANA.

Further correspondence relating to disturbances in British Guiana (in continuation of [Cd. 2322.], March, 1906).

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3676. France (French Budget for 1906).

No. 3677. Zanzibar.

No. 3678. Colombia (Barranquilla).

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT (FRESCOES).

Further memoranda by Professor Church, F.R.S., concerning the wall paintings in the Palace of Westminster.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Royal Warrant bearing date September 16th, 1905, amending the Statutes; Royal Warrant bearing date June 6th, 1906, amending the Statutes.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated July 19th, 1906, providing for special grants in aid of certain school boards in Scotland.

MOTOR CARS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars. Vol. I. Report. Vol. II. Minutes of evidence, with appendices and index.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Read 1^{a}, and to be printed. (No. 170.)

CAPTURE OF MERCHANT SHIPS IN WAR TIME.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government if they will take care not to weaken the naval element in the Committee appointed to investigate the question of national indemnity against loss by capture at sea in time of war by changing the naval member of it during the inquiry, as was unfortunately done in the case of the Royal Commission on the supply of food and raw material in time of war; and whether, considering how little our merchant ships appear to have done to avoid capture during the Russo-Japanese war, they will consider the propriety of supplementing the naval war-courses at our seaports by a short mercantile war-course for the purpose of teaching captains and owners of merchant ships the lost art of avoiding capture in time of war, so as to lessen the amount of the indemnities and losses that may become payable either by the Government or by underwriters and others whenever we may be at war ourselves.

As regards the first part of my Question, I do not wish to be understood as referring in any way to the comparative merits or qualifications of the officers who have served or are serving on the Commissions or Committee that I have referred to in my Question. I have had no comunication with these officers. I only wish to point out that it is of immense importance that the problem as to whether we are to starve or not in war-time should be correctly solved. If the officer who is to report on behalf of the Navy is not put on the Committee until half the evidence has been heard, he is at a great disadvantage when laying his views before other members of the Committee, and has also much less time in which to study his subject.

The naval member of the Committee now taking evidence holds, I think, a position of at least equal comparative importance to the command of a fleet in time of peace, because if legislation proceeds on a wrong basis, it may have a far reaching effect, and it would be found more difficult to repeal an Act of Parliament than it would be to recall any injudicious orders given by a Commander-in-Chief. I would therefore ask the first Lord of the Admiralty not to allow the naval officer on this Committee to be changed until the report or reports are completed. Every assistance ought to be given to him by the Intelligence and other Departments of the Admiralty. The questions as to what precautions, if any, were taken to prevent the capture of insured ships during the Russo-Japanese war should be thoroughly gone into by the Committee. Those captures constitute an object lesson which ought not to be neglected. If the Russian Government had agreed to indemnify their shipowners from capture during the Russo-Japanese war, nine-tenths of the ships in the Russian mercantile navy would have sailed for Siberia and Manchuria, and would now be under the Japanese flag. Very few of the Russian ships would have succeeded in evading the blockade. The value of the captured ships and cargoes would have gone far towards recouping the Japanese for the expenses of the war, and the additional strain on the Russian exchequer would have completed the financial ruin of that country.

As regards our own shipping, it is clear that our underwriters grievously miscalculated the chances of capture. They thoroughly knew their own business as regards percentages of losses from strandings or collisions. They appear, however, to have been quite incapable of grasping the question of the percentage of risk in war, and as to how it would vary in certain places from day to day according to the positions of belligerent ships. I have tried to investigate the matter, but I cannot find that any additional precautions were taken to avoid capture, that any premiums for success were promised to the officers and crew, or that the number of officers and men carried were increased for the purpose of keeping that careful lookout which is the first condition of commercial safety in war. In peace time, ships at a distance do not interest a merchant ship, but in war time the moment a streak of smoke is seen in any direction it is a matter of vital importance to notice it and find out by whom it is caused. To do this efficiently it is necessary to carry a larger crew than usual, as several men must be on the look out.

During the old French war, foreign prisons were very uncomfortable, and how to keep out of them was a matter which merchant seamen studied in many cases as carefully as if they were naval officers in small vessels. Many of them escaped by stratagem by disguising their ships as line of battleships, making sham signals to a non-existent escort, creeping close in shore, running into a rain squall and then altering course. These tricks can be studied in the naval literature of the period. During the civil war in America I heard of innumerable dodges put in practice both by blockaders and blockade-runners. Speed was not the only factor required to ensure safety. Many slow ships well commanded made repeated successful runs; even some sailing ships got through. The chief factors in getting the vessels through were the knowledge and skill of the officers in command. Most of the blockade-runners flew the British flag and both officers and men received high wages and were given premiums for every successful run. Some of these vessels were in charge of commanders on the half-pay list of our Navy, who had assumed other names. Their ships as a rule were most successful. Many of the merchant captains were, however, equally fortunate. The recent captures in Japanese seas would certainly not have been so numerous had these ships been as efficiently officered and manned as the blockade runners in the American war. The prolongation of peace and the destruction of piracy has caused the greater part of this knowledge to be forgotten. Except by the few who ran the American blockade it has not been wanted since 1814.

The officers of the naval reserve form a most valuable link between the Royal Navy and the merchant service. They are, however, few in number and could only be increased with difficulty and expense. Moreover, in a war with a first-class Power the Royal Navy would have a prior claim upon their services. Their withdrawal from the merchant service would increase the chance of capture of the ships to which they had formerly belonged. Therefore I think it very desirable that the number of the officers in the Royal Naval Reserve should be supplemented by officers who have been taught, not so much the duties of an officer on board a fighting ship, as the duties of an officer on board a merchant ship in war time. Admiral Lord Charles Beresford recently drew attention to the risks run by showing what a small proportion of merchant-vessels thought it a part of their duty to pay any attention to the signals of a man of war. Had war broken out, he could not have warned them of their danger.

As the captains of merchant ships are under the control of shipowners, the latter may be considered as the admirals of the mercantile marine, and as such should also be given adequate opportunities for instruction. At present, as far as I can gather, all that is now being considered is the question as to who ought to bear the burden of losses in war. It is, I think, far more important to consider the question of minimising these losses by teaching our shipowners and master-mariners how to avoid them as much as possible. The officers of the Royal Navy who have been through our naval war-course could, I think, easily evolve a mercantile war-course, which with practice and experience would become more and more efficient. Shipowners and master mariners should be allowed to attend as long as they complied with certain rules and regulations. They should lodge outside the dockyards, so as to lessen any chance of disciplinary arrangements being interfered with. A gentleman holding a semi-official position and well acquainted with the merchant service has suggested to me that it would be desirable to issue a text-book on this subject for the benefit of those unable to attend such a course, and that after a certain time candidates for the certificates of master and mate might be required to show some knowledge of these matters on presenting themselves for examination.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, the noble Lord asked me, in the first place, a question with regard to the inconvenience caused by the naval officer not having attended right through the sittings of the Royal Commission on the supply of food and raw material in time of war. We, too, are very sorry that the naval officer originally appointed to serve on the Commission was not able to sit through the whole of the inquiry, but when I tell your Lordships that the distinguished officer was Sir Gerard Noel and that he was required to take up a command in China, you will see that it was inadvisable that he should continue to serve on the Commission. With regard to the present Committee sitting on the question of national indemnity against loss by capture at sea in time of war, another distinguished naval officer is representing the Admiralty on that Committee, and so far as I am aware there is no likelihood of his being taken away during the course of the sittings of that Committee; although, of course, the requirements of His Majesty's Service must always take precedence of the sittings of any Commission or Committee, however important that body may be.

The noble Lord has rather laid it down that our merchant ships during the Russo-Japanese war did not take sufficient precautions to avoid capture at sea, and that they had lost the art of avoiding capture in time of war. There are two classes of merchant ships which were subjected to capture during the Russo-Japanese war—the class which unwittingly carried contraband goods, and consequently, not knowing that they were doing wrong, did not seek to avoid capture; and the class which was knowingly endeavouring to introduce contraband goods for the benefit of one side or the other. With regard to them my information does not quite tally with that of the noble Lord. I do not think the owners or captains of such ships would be likely to proclaim from the housetops the success of their manœuvres and adventures or to tell how they managed to outwit the Fleets; but I have heard from our naval attachés out there that some British ships were extremely successful in their operations and showed that they had thoroughly mastered the art of evading capture by hostile fleets.

Then my noble friend asked me whether it is proposed by the Admiralty to supplement the excellent war-course at Portsmouth, of which it is not possible to speak too highly, by a mercantile war-course for the purpose of teaching captains and owners of merchant ships the art of avoiding capture in time of war. The Admiralty for many reasons do not think the suggestion a desirable one to adopt. But I am quite sure Lord Ellenborough will not on that account think that the subject of his anxiety is escaping the notice of the Admiralty. The question is being carefully considered, and most elaborate instructions are being drawn up to be given to captains of merchant vessels on this very point. I am sure also that the noble Lord will agree that it is not desirable for me to state to your Lordships what these instructions are.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 3ª—(*Earl Carrington.*)

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I have been asked to mention publicly the desire of those connected with large works, whose machinery will have to be considerably altered, that sufficient time should be allowed for carrying out the necessary alterations under the Bill so as to avoid unnecessary injury.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I am glad to be able to assure my noble and learned friend that that will be done. Mr. Burns met the manager of the works which my noble and learned friend has in his mind, and I believe a perfectly satisfactory arrangement has been come to. The Bill does not come into operation until January 1st next year, and I can assure my noble and learned friend that every facility will be given to the company in question to carry out their alterations.

On Question, Bill read 3ª and passed.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether it is a fact that the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland is to inquire into the working of the Congested Districts Board, and the relations of the Board with the Land Commission and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; whether two of the members of the Commission are also members of the Congested Districts Board; and whether there is any precedent for appointing to a Commission to inquire into the working of a public board or department persons who are themselves members of the particular board or department; whether under the circumstances, and seeing that the landowners of the congested districts of the West of Ireland are not represented on the Commission, His Majesty's Government will add to the Commission one or more persons representing the interests of landowners within the congested districts of the west, and conversant with the industries best suited for the relief of congestion.

The object of my question is to call attention to the unusual and incomplete constitution of the Commission to inquire into congestion in Ireland. As to the first point, it appears a singular proceeding that of the nine members of the Commission appointed to inquire, among other things, into the working of the Congested Districts Board, two of them should be prominent members of that Board. I am, of course, aware that the object of the Commission is not to call in question the previous action of the Board on account of any alleged or supposed shortcomings, but, on the contrary, to strengthen their hands; and I rejoice that it should be so. I am firmly of opinion that the Congested Districts Board has done a great deal of most valuable work under very considerable difficulties, and I should be glad, therefore, to see their scope of action extended, and additional facilities, within certain limits, granted to them. But I should have thought that the necessary information as to the working of that Board and its relations with other Departments, could have been just as well obtained by calling upon the members of the Board to give evidence before the Commission, and in that way the somewhat unusual course would have been avoided of putting them on the Commission and making them, to a certain extent, the judges to review their own work. I should like to know whether there is any precedent for the adoption of such a course.

As to the second point, I hold that the constitution of the Commission is incomplete. The scope of inquiry as laid down in the terms of reference is extremely wide, but from the able and interesting speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in the House of Commons, it would appear that the scope is very much wider still. In fact, it seemed from some passages in the right hon. Gentleman's speech as if it might extend to the whole of Ireland. In any case, the inquiry covers far more than the scheduled districts in which the Congested Districts Board has been working. Many of your Lordships are probably aware that when the Congested Districts Board was originally appointed, certain districts were specified in the schedule of the Act over which they were to work. These districts were those in which congestion existed to the greatest extent; but I have often heard it remarked—and remarked with great justice—that the line was rather narrowly drawn, and that there were other districts outside the boundaries of these scheduled districts which ought to have been included. I therefore presume that the intention is to extend the operation of the Congested Districts Board over all congested districts in Ireland.

Now, the counties where congestion mostly exists are the western counties, from Cork in the South to Donegal in the north; and in the greater part of this area the land-owning interest is not in any way represented. As far as the southern counties Cork and Kerry are concerned, no one could question for a moment the appointment of Sir John Colomb, a most worthy representative of the land-owning interest; but, as was pointed out by the Chief Secretary in his speech to which I have referred, the conditions of the counties of Cork and Kerry differ materially from those of the county of Clare and the whole of Connaught, in that in Cork and Kerry there is practically no land available for the relief of congestion. It is only in the province of Connaught and in the county of Clare where this land is available. It is therefore vitally important to the land-owning interest that somebody to represent that interest should be appointed on the Commission, and the more so as the Chief Secretary appears from his speech to contemplate the possibility of compulsorily acquiring land for the purpose of relieving congestion. It is needless to say that I do not approve of compulsion—no one, I believe, does when he thinks it may be applied to himself. I do not, however, think that compulsion would in most cases be necessary if the Congested Districts Board were prepared to offer a fair price for the land required, a price which would indemnify the vendor, and secure him from financial loss. I believe that they would usually be able to acquire the necessary land except under circumstances which I will now explain.

Throughout the West of Ireland, whenever negotiations are proceeding for the sale of property from the landlord to the tenant, or there is any prospect of such a sale, the tenants are accustomed to stipulate, as a condition, that all untenanted land on the estate should be broken up and divided among them, or given, perhaps, to their sons or near relatives. They would deprecate, they would ever strongly resent strangers being brought in from another locality. If therefore, while such proceedings are pending, or when there is a prospect of such proceedings, the Congested Districts Board step in and arbitrarily seize upon land of this description, the result will be that the negotiations will fall through, and all prospect of a sale will be at an end. This would inflict a very serious loss on the landlord, and I think the result would not be acceptable to His Majesty's Government, for I suppose they are anxious to see the Land Purchase Act work quickly and smoothly. It is, therefore, most important that some representative of the land-owning interest should be on the Commission who would be well aware of the existence of this difficulty.

There is a further point, which is, perhaps, more a matter of detail, but which is quite worthy of consideration. It appears to be ignored, or at least, overlooked, by those who are calling out for the immediate division of grass lands—"ranches" would appear to be the popular designation of farms much over 100 acres—that the quality of these grass lands varies materially, and that a great deal is not well adapted for tillage. I know that is the opinion of those who have a far greater knowledge of agriculture and the value of land than I can possibly pretend to possess. They hold that a great deal of this land is absolutely unfit for tillage by small farmers. I have heard of a case where the experiment was tried many years ago and utterly failed. I recognise that this is a matter of detail, and that the selection of land would be for the Congested Districts Board in their future working, and not for the Royal Commission to go into, but at the same time it would be as well that they should have this difficulty before them when they are making recommendations, as they may do, as to the future acquisition of grass lands.

There is only one other point. The Chief Secretary pointed out that in those counties where no land is available, other means must be resorted to in order to relieve congestion. This has been done, and done with great success, by the Congested Districts Board along the seaboard, by encouraging fisheries. This, of course, does not apply to the inland portions, and, therefore, some means of encouraging industries must be resorted to there, in order to relieve the people from their unfortunate position. There are a number of persons in Ireland who have devoted themselves for many years to the promotion of small cottage industries, and I think it would be very desirable that one or two gentlemen of this description should be appointed members of the Commission. I therefore ask His Majesty's Government whether they would be prepared to consent to two members, representing the landlords' interest, being added to the Commission—this would be only fair as there are already on the Commission several members who notoriously entertain most advanced views in another direction—and also to consent to the addition of one or two gentleman conversant with the industries of the country.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, I rise early in the debate to say how cordially I concur with the speech of my noble friend who has just sat down, and who speaks with undoubted authority on the Congested Districts Board system in the West of Ireland. He has, I am glad to know, gone beyond the Question on the Paper and entered into matters of detail, because the question of stock rearing in that part of Ireland with which he is conversant is an important branch of industry, and if it were in any way checked it would have very injurious results to all interests in that part of Ireland. The breaking up of these ranches, as they are called, would to my mind be an injury of an incalculable character.

The main object of my noble friend, however, has been to call attention to the fact that the Commission as at present constituted is not thoroughly representative of all the interests and industries of Ireland. The landowning interest is represented by but one member. My noble friend spoke in terms of eulogy of Sir John Colomb, whom we all respect in Ireland, but outside Ulster the landowners' interest is not represented. We contend that the Government should give ample representation to all classes. I fully recognise what a difficult task it is to appoint a Commission whose constitution should give satisfaction to every individual interested, and I always give the Government credit for endeavouring to constitute Commissions in such a way as at any rate to represent the majority of views. But I endorse the contention of my noble friend that there ought to be at least two more representatives of the landowning interest on this Commission.

Though the terms of the reference to the Commission are wide, the speech of the Chief Secretary in another place gave a still wider construction to them. The Chief Secretary said—

> "If they were to have a Board with greater powers in the future, and if they were to have the work the Board were doing in those districts done in others by another Board, much more complete information than they possessed would be required with regard to what had already been done and with regard to the lines which should be followed in the future. . . . . . . .No doubt by far the largest portion of the areas congested were those which came under the present management of the Board."†

And the right hon. Gentleman added—

> "But there were other areas which, though they might not call them in the strictest sense congested, were areas where limits similar to those of the congested districts should be applied."‡

That being the case, I venture to say there ought to be placed on this Commission some gentleman who would represent those other areas and districts in which there are industries of an important character. Under the terms of the Chief Secretary's speech Ulster itself can be included in the reference to the Commission, and I think it would be extremely unfair if the Government did not appoint two gentlemen conversant with the other industries in the districts to which the Chief Secretary referred.

I am not going to cavil at the names of the members of the Commission except one, but I certainly endorse what was said by my noble friend, that it is a very remarkable thing that two of the most prominent members of the Congested Districts Board should be appointed to a Commission to inquire into the working of that Board. I hope the noble Lord who replies on behalf of His Majesty's Government will tell us whether there is any precedent for the chief officer of the Executive in Ireland being placed on a Commission appointed to inquire into the working of a Board of which, I presume, in the absence of the Chief Secretary, he would be chairman. Again, I turn to the Bishop of Raphoe. I say nothing about the right rev. Gentleman's desire to do his best by the Congested Districts Board; but he is a very influential member of that Board and is placed on this Commission. I hope we shall have an answer, before the debate closes, as to whether there is any precedent for this course of action.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1207.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1207.

I will give your Lordships parallel cases. Supposing a Commission were appointed to inquire into the working of a railway, what would be thought if on that Commission were placed the deputy chairman and the general manager of that railway company. By the Government of the late Lord Salisbury there was appointed the Fry Commission to inquire into the working of the Land Commission. The appointment gave general satisfaction; but what would have been the attitude of the Nationalist Members in another place, or even the noble Lords opposite, if on that Commission Lord Salisbury had placed the two leading Land Commissioners? I venture to say that the denunciations heaped on the appointment of that Commission would have been loud and long.

I now come to what I think is an even more serious question. I confess, after having read the leading article in *The Times* this morning on the appointment of Mr. Conor O'Kelly to this Commission, that I look with absolute astonishment to the fact that he was ever appointed. Until I read the article in *The Times* I had no idea of Mr. Conor O'Kelly's career beyond this, that he was one of the Nationalist Members. But I read in *The Times* that he became chairman of the Mayo County Council at the first election under Mr. Gerald Balfour's Irish Local Government Act, and as such was *ex officio* a justice of the peace, but was removed under a power reserved by the Act, which under the existing *régime* has been allowed to lapse, in consequence of a violent speech attacking the British Government and the British Army during the South African War. He was elected for North Mayo in 1900, and before the change of Ministers at the close of last year he was prosecuted for a harangue inciting to terrorism and boycotting and committed for trial. But one of the earliest acts of the new Administration was to withdraw the prosecution.

As Mr. Conor O'Kelly has been placed on this important Commission, it would be interesting to know the reason why that prosecution was withdrawn. *The Times* goes on to say that—

> "At the beginning of May seven holdings near Ardagh were advertised for sale by auction, but the local Nationalists, headed by Mr. O'Kelly, determined to prevent this by threats and intimidation, in order that there should be a forced sale of the land to the Congested Districts Board for division among 'the people.' Mr. O'Kelly called upon 'the people' to boycott any persons attempting to buy the farms, though there was no plea of previous occupancy or claim by evicted tenants. He boasted that, by combination, all bidders would be excluded, and went on to say that, if the demand for division through the Board was not quickly complied with, 'let Mr. Bryce and those associated with him understand that those who find themselves at the head of the people will be constrained to have no further responsibility for maintaining peace and order.' A few days later he said, in the plainest language, 'They wanted this auction smashed; let them kill it, and save themselves and save the West.' These terrorist appeals were unnoticed by the Government, and some weeks later Mr. O'Kelly, encouraged by impunity, addressed another meeting at Callow, denouncing a man who was openly named as a grabber.' 'Are you not going,' he said, 'to bring sufficient pressure on him to compel him to yield up his ill-gotten goods?' They should make the offender 'feel that he is a public enemy, and must take the consequences of being a public enemy.'" †

This is the gentleman who has been appointed by His Majesty's Government to serve as an impartial member of this Commission to inquire into the working of the Congested Districts Board.

I trust I shall hear from the noble Earl or from some Member of the Cabinet reasons to explain this appointment. I ask them, if they do not approve of the language which has been made use of by Mr. Conor O'Kelly, how they can agree to his appointment. Perhaps it is difficult to displace any member already appointed on the Commission, but it is the absolute duty of His Majesty's Government to add to the Commission a number of gentlemen who at any rate will counteract the opinions of other members whose views are already known. We know full well that the other members of the Commission are more or less what are called in Ireland as "Devolutionists." They do not appeal to the Unionist Party in Ireland and do not represent the views of the Loyalist section, and unless some additions are made to the Commission it is easy for anyone acquainted with Ireland to forecast what will be the Report of that Commission. The Report will be signed, perhaps, by all the members with the exception of the one representative of the landowning and Loyalist class in Ireland, Sir John Colomb. Of what use will that be? We do not ask that any names should be eliminated from the Commission, but that there should be added gentlemen who represent the views of the landowning and industrial class. In that way you might obtain a satisfactory Report, and arrive at a conclusion which might be for the benefit of Ireland.

---

† See *The Times*, *July* 23, 1906.

*Lord ORANMORE and BROWNE: My Lords, I hope His Majesty's Government may be able to assure us that they are willing to give a favourable consideration to the suggestions put forward by my noble friend Lord Clonbrock. It would be impossible to affirm that Irish landowners view with unmixed pleasure the appointment of this Commission. For the last thirty-five years they have seen portions of their property taken away from them little by little; they have been obliged to accept tenants without any choice as to who they should be; they have seen their land in many cases deteriorated by bad cultivation and want of capital; they have found themselves changed from the position of landowners to merely rent-chargers with an ever-decreasing rent charge; but still some of them have had a certain amount of untenanted land which they have been able to work in a satisfactory way. Irish landlords, like everybody else, know that the public welfare must in the end prevail, and if it is decided that it is for the future good that they should be deprived of their lands they will bow to the inevitable, always hoping and believing that they will obtain the same compensation as would be accorded to landowners in this country or in Scotland were their land taken compulsorily.

I should like, very briefly, to consider the composition of this Commission. I am not going through all the names of the gentlemen upon it, and I do not need to say very much with regard to one member of the Commission, Mr. Conor O'Kelly, as the noble Marquess (Lord Londonderry) has already given us full particulars of his career. But I should like to say that Mr. Conor O'Kelly has lived all his life in a congested district; that he has taken great interest in the subject of congestion; that he has urged his views in violent speeches, and that he represents that class of anti-English Irishmen who advocate the well known single ticket to Holyhead as sufficient compensation for any confiscation of landlords' property. This gentleman may be an excellent exponent of the views of the extreme party, and, as I do not suppose it is contended for one moment that this Commission is impartial but is intended to represent all shades of view, he may be a proper person put on it; but we have a strong case to urge that in opposition to him we should have somebody representing the landowners of the west, who may represent to the Commission, in the first place, that compulsion is absolutely unnecessary, and that it is easy to get sufficient land voluntarily if the Land Commissioners are prepared to give a proper price for it. In addition to that, there is the argument of my noble friend Lord Clonbrock as to the land in many cases being unsuitable for breaking up. Again what is the use of giving land to tenants if you do not give them money to stock it or work it with?

I do not think it is understood in England what an important body the graziers of Ireland are, and how they represent the middle-class in that country. If you do away with them and if the grass lands are broken up, you will deprive the tenants of those to whom they look to purchase their cattle when they are a year or so old. Another point which the representative of the landlord could urge on this Commission is that if you take away all the advantages of country life landlords will remove to England, taking with them not only the £112,000,000 provided under the Act of 1903, but whatever additional money may be necessary for carrying out the work of this Commission. It may be urged by the Nationalist Party that if somebody representing the landowners is placed on this Commission we shall have too much representation. By all means let another Nationalist be added. The great point in a Commission of this kind is that it should be as far as possible satisfactory to everybody. If we obtain more representation, whatever the Report of the Commission may be, I think it would be received, if not with acclamation, at least with resignation by the landowners of Ireland.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I am much obliged to the noble Lord opposite for his courtesy in giving me private notice of the Question which he has put on the Paper to-day, and I hope that I may respectfully express my sense of the studiously moderate and carefully considered speeches which have been delivered by the noble Lords who have so far taken part in this debate. Perhaps the noble Lord opposite will allow me, first of all, categorically to answer the Questions he has put on the Paper. The noble Lord asks, first, whether it is the fact that the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland is to inquire into the working of the Congested Districts Board, and the relations of the Board with the Land Commission and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. The Answer to that Question is in the affirmative. I have here the full terms of the reference to the Royal Commission, but I expect the noble Lord has them in his possession and I need not read them.

THE EARL OF MAYO: Did they appear in *The Times*?

LORD DENMAN: I am not sure in what papers they appeared, but they have appeared in the Press. Lord Clonbrock asked, as a supplementary Question, whether it is proposed to extend the scope of this Commission all over Ireland. So far as I know, that is the case.

*LORD CLONBROCK: All over Ireland?

LORD DENMAN: All over the congested districts of Ireland. Then the noble Lord asks in his Question whether two of the members of the Commission are also members of the Congested Districts Board. The Answer to that is in the affirmative. The two gentlemen are Dr. O'Donnell, the Bishop of Raphoe, and Sir Antony MacDonnell. The noble Lord then asked, and he was reinforced by the noble Marquess, whether there is any precedent for appointing to a Commission to inquire into the working of a public board or department persons who are themselves members of the board or department. The Answer to that Question is also in the affirmative.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: Can the noble Lord give us the precedent?

LORD DENMAN: Yes. On the University of London Commission in 1898, which was appointed by Statute to reconstitute the University, two members of London University were appointed. Then there is another instance, when a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, was appointed as one of the Commissioners at the Trinity College inquiry. But an even more striking incident which I can quote as a precedent recently took place in Ireland. I refer to the action of the late Government in 1898, when the entire Intermediate Education Board were appointed as a Royal Commission to inquire into the system of intermediate education in Ireland as administered by themselves, and into the practical working of that system. I would further point out that no other members whatever were appointed upon that Commission.

Referring generally to the questions which noble Lords opposite have raised, I may say that the Government have thought it desirable that there should be on the Commission, which is not appointed in any sense in hostility to the Congested Districts Board, two members of the Board whose practical knowledge of the problems to be dealt with will aid their fellow Commissioners. Noble Lords asserted that His Majesty's Government had not given sufficient representation to the landlord interest, but I was glad to notice that they went out of their way to speak in eulogistic terms of Sir John Colomb as a gentleman well fitted to serve on the Commission for this purpose. Surely Sir John Colomb may be trusted to take care, to a considerable extent, at all events, of the landlord's interests on this particular Commission. He is an Irish landowner who resides in the neighbourhood of Kerry, one of the congested districts, and I am informed that he owns over 3,000 acres of land in that county.

His Majesty's Government consider that the Commission is well constituted for the purpose of this inquiry, and they do not think its efficiency would be increased by any addition to its numbers. Reference has been made to the question of compulsion as applied to the purchase of land in congested districts. I regret that, from my slight experience of these matters, I am unable to follow noble Lords off-hand into a discussion on this point; but I undertake to represent what has been said upon it to the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I assume that the main object in appointing a Royal Commission is to endeavour to obtain a fair and impartial Report from those who have been placed on the Commission with a view to their representative character and to the knowledge they can bring to bear on the question. It is quite obvious that a Commission which does not fairly represent the various interests involved cannot be regarded as satisfactory. The noble Lord who has just spoken stated the scope of this Commission, which is as wide as could well be conceived; it is not confined to Connaught but is to apply to every part of Ireland in which any person can suggest there is a congested district. That shows the great width of this inquiry, and it is obvious, therefore, that all who are deeply interested in the finding of the Commission should have legitimate and fair representation upon it. That is not saying too much. There is no one in this House who is more respected in Ireland or who carries more weight than my noble friend Lord Clonbrock, and the views he has expressed are worthy of serious attention of his Majesty's Government.

The noble Lord who replied on behalf of the Irish Government quoted precedents, but I venture to think they have no bearing upon this question. The placing of a fellow of a University on a Commission to inquire into matters connected with that University is not at all analogous to what has been done in this case. The case of the Intermediate Education Board is really no precedent at all, for that Board themselves asked that they should be turned into a Commission in order that they might be free to make representations to Parliament and to the Irish Government as to what was best to be done in regard to their future. The present Administration is in its infancy, but it seems to thrive on Royal Commissions. His Majesty's Government have three or four already in Ireland. That is a fair beginning. They appointed a Commission a couple of months ago to inquire into Sir Horace Plunkett's department, but they did not put Sir Horace or any member of his staff on the Commission. They did not do so because they wanted an independent examination as to the working of his Board.

The landowners of Connaught, which is the largest province, and contains the greatest number of congested districts, have no representation whatever on this Commission. Is that fair or just in view of the fact that the Commission is intended to inquire largely into how in future Connaught landowners are to be allowed to enjoy their property, and what interference they are to submit to? Putting it on the human ground, is that fair? Has it even the purport of fairness? Sir John Colomb, whom we all highly respect, lives in Kerry and will be concerned with the special interests of Kerry. I submit that it is grossly unfair that on this Commission there is not a single representative of the landlords of the other portions of Ireland to say how their property in the congested districts should be dealt with. The landowners will be largely on their trial. They will be asked, "Would not this be a good expedient?" and, "Would not that be a good expedient?" all affecting and interfering with their property. On these grounds I think it reasonable that the Government should consider very earnestly whether representatives of the landowning interest cannot be added to the Commission.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I have no word to say against the Congested Districts Board, but I would much prefer that the Government should deal with the question rather than appoint a Commission As to the *personnel* of the Commission, we have, first, the Bishop of Raphoe and Sir Antony MacDonnell, who are members of the Congested Districts Board. No member has done his work better or is more respected than the Bishop of Raphoe. He is an excellent member of that Board, but he is asked to inquire into what he has been doing himself. As Under-Secretary for Ireland one would naturally think that Sir Antony MacDonnell would have quite enough to do while the Chief Secretary is entirely in this country in looking after affairs in Ireland without being placed on the Commission.

The main point is that this Commission is going to inquire into the congested state of the West, but there is not a single representative of land on the Commission except Sir John Colomb. According to the noble Lord who spoke on behalf of the Irish Office, Sir John Colomb possesses 3,000 acres of land in Kerry, but he does not own land in the West. I ask whether the Commission will be likely to have much weight in Ireland when it has upon it no representative of the West or North and no representative of those small industries in Ireland which the Congested Districts Board have done so much to foster ? The Chief Secretary in his speech said—

> "He heartily echoed the opinion expressed by hon. Members that the Commission ought not to be in any sense partisan, but should be one which would inspire confidence. It was not altogether easy, however, in a country so much divided by political Parties as Great Britain to find people with absolutely open and dispassionate minds, but he would do his best to find people who would inspire confidence." †

Speaking as an Irish landlord, and knowing that I am backed by the opinion of a great many people who are not landowners, I frankly declare that the Commission as appointed by the Government does not inspire confidence in the country.

I notice that the noble Lord who answered on behalf of the Government most carefully avoided any reference to Mr. Conor O'Kelly. I ask noble Lords opposite, is the name of Mr. Conor O'Kelly and the recollection of speeches he has made likely to inspire confidence in the conclusions of a Commission of which that gentleman is a member ? This matter was put most directly to the Government, but the noble Lord shirked answering the question. I hope before this debate closes we shall hear something on this point from a member of the Government and that we shall be shown what were the special qualifications of Mr. Conor O'Kelly for a seat on the Commission. I am aware that Mr. Conor O'Kelly takes the greatest interest in congested districts. Not only Nationalist Members desire to lessen the evils of congestion; a great many of the Party and class to which I belong wish to see the West put into a much better condition than it is in at present. That is a matter of means, a matter of being generous with money properly administered by the Congested Districts Board and the Estates Commissioners. These bodies could deal with the subject if properly backed by the Government, and I do not think there is any necessity for a Royal Commission, especially one constituted as this one is.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I hope I may be allowed to begin by re-echoing what fell from my noble friend behind me, and congratulating noble Lords opposite upon the great moderation with which they have treated this question. Irish Questions, as we know, are sometimes apt to arouse strong feelings, and strong feelings occasionally produce strong language; but on this occasion I am sure we shall all agree that the subject has been treated with a sobriety and moderation in every way becoming to debates in your Lordships' House.

I am quite certain that in appointing this Commission the Chief Secretary and the Irish Government had every desire to meet the reasonable wishes of the land-owning class in Ireland, but I cannot help thinking that the point at which we on this side join issue with noble Lords opposite is that we have a somewhat different idea of what the composition of a Royal Commission as such ought to be, and what is necessary in considering the names of individuals who are to be placed on such a Commission. It does not appear to me to be in many cases possible, and I cannot myself see that it is even always desirable, to attempt to represent upon a Royal Commission every possible interest in relation to the subject to be inquired into. After all, the main functions of a Commission are to take certain evidence and to embody in a Report the conclusions which they themselves arrive at from that evidence. If the Report can be a unanimous one, so much the better; but if, as sometimes happens, a Royal Commission is so composed that it is quite impossible to produce a unanimous Report, the conclusions of the Commission, I think, are thereby often greatly weakened, as people treat the different Reports as being essentially partisan and attach less weight to them than they would to a Report arrived at in a more unanimous manner.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1208.

As to this particular Commission, it appears to me that noble Lords somewhat misunderstand the object with which the Commission is appointed. This Commission is not appointed to inquire into the Congested Districts Board in anything like a hostile sense, or even in a strictly critical sense. It is simply designed to assist the working of the Congested Districts Board, of which all of us who have had experience can speak in the highest terms, and to see whether its beneficent action can be advantageously extended to some districts which at present do not fall within its purview. That appears to me a complete answer to the question of the noble Lord as to placing members of the Congested Districts Board on this Commission. The case which the noble Marquess stated of an imaginary Commission to inquire into a railway, on which the deputy-chairman and general manager were placed, does not really apply, because what is done is not to inquire so much into the proceedings of the Congested Districts Board as to call that Board into council with a view, as I have said, of seeing whether its operations can be extended.

In those circumstances I confess I cannot see that there is any impropriety whatever in placing on the Commission a distinguished member of the Board such as Bishop O'Donnell. As regards the Under-Secretary, he is a member of the Congested Districts Board and through that means has acquired, I have no doubt, a large knowledge of this question; but I do not think it would be reasonable to say that it is purely as a member of the Board that he is placed on the Commission. I should have thought it would be more accurate to say he was placed on this Commission in his capacity as Under-Secretary.

Something has been said about the *personnel* of the Commission, but there has been one very notable omission from the speeches of the noble Lords in dealing with that matter. I have heard no allusion to the Chairman of the Commission, Lord Dudley. I should certainly have supposed that in appointing as Chairman of the Commission the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland under the late Government, the present Irish Government were offering the strongest pledge of their desire for an impartial review of this question. We know, of course, that Lord Dudley did not find himself in absolute accord with the whole of Irish opinion during the full period of his stay in Ireland, but I think we are bound to assume, as he held the office of Viceroy up to the moment of the resignation of the late Government, that he represents the views of noble Lords opposite upon this and upon all other matters connected with Ireland. Then as regards the question of landlord representation. I need say nothing with regard to Sir John Colomb, whose name has received so many tributes in this debate. I am under the impression that Mr. Kavanagh is also a landowner, and a member of the Irish Landowners' Convention.

LORD ASHBOURNE: No.

*LORD CLONBROCK: He has withdrawn himself from the Convention owing, I suppose, to a change of opinion. But, at any rate, he is not a land-owner in the West.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: But he is a land-owner. On the question of the importance of the land-owning element being represented, I come back to what I said before, that, after all, the important point is not so much who sits on the Commission as representing a particular set of views. The important point is to see that all those who sit on the Commission are men of ability who take a general interest in these questions, and are, therefore, likely to secure all the evidence obtainable from every class of person in Ireland upon the question which they have to decide.

Lord Clonbrock mentioned an interesting point as to the varying character of the grazing lands in the West, stating that there was a considerable area of these lands not fitted for turning into farms in the manner with which we are so familiar. I should have thought that a matter which is certain to be inquired into by the Commission. Every opportunity will be given to those who desire to press that point, and I cannot for the life of me see how its discussion would be facilitated by the fact that some gentleman who happens to be a landlord owning grazing land of that kind had a seat on the Commission. The same thing applies to the cottage industries. There, again, it is quite incredible that any Commission worthy of the name could omit inquiry into those industries; and I am glad to think that there can be no disagreement as to the desirability of increasing the small industries of Ireland.

With regard to Mr. Conor O'Kelly, I am not personally acquainted with his career. I read the article which appeared in *The Times* of this morning, and in which he is no doubt very unfavourably mentioned, and I do know this much—that he has taken an active part in the agitation for dividing grazing lands into small holdings. I believe it is also the case that he has, I am afraid like many others, used unwarrantably strong language in presenting his views. But, at the same time I would ask noble Lords to remember that he has, by the admission of Lord Oranmore and others, taken a very special interest in this subject and has a very special knowledge of it; and it certainly cannot be regarded as unnatural or unreasonable in the abstract that a Member of Parliament representing one of the divisions of a county that contains more small holdings and a larger congested district than any other—the county of Mayo—should appear on the Commission.

I am sorry we have not been able to meet noble Lords opposite in this matter. It is not on account of any indifference on the part of the Chief Secretary or the Irish Government in considering the just claims of Irish landlords, but it is rather because we do not take precisely the same view of the necessary composition and of the functions of a Royal Commission as appears to be taken by the noble Lords opposite.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I think there would have been more point in the noble Earl's compliments on the moderation of the speeches to-night if he had been able to announce that the representations made with so much earnestness would receive consideration at the hands of His Majesty's Ministers; because, after all, we are agreed in this, that what is most necessary is that this Royal Commission should inspire public confidence; and it is quite clear that at some points the Commission, as now constituted, stops far short of doing so.

I may, however, say at once that I do not go quite so far as some of my noble friends in objecting to the presence upon the Commission of gentlemen who are themselves members of the Congested Districts Board. If the inquiry had been an inquiry into alleged malpractices on the part of the Congested Districts Board, it would have obviously been a scandal that members of that Board should be given a place upon the Commission. But, after listening to what has been said by noble Lords opposite, I gather that this is by no means the case. What I understand is desired is that there should be an inquiry directed to increasing the usefulness of the Board, extending the scope of its operations, and simplifying its procedure, particularly by avoiding a certain conflict of authority which I believe at present exists between the Board and other public boards in Ireland. That being so, I do not take the same objections which some of my noble friends do to the inclusion of two members of the Board upon the Royal Commission; for I think we are all agreed in desiring that the work of the Congested Districts Board should be facilitated and its usefulness increased. I am under the impression from what has come within my own observation that the Board has done an immense deal of good in many parts of Ireland in a very unobtrusive way and upon very cheap and economical terms. I for one, therefore, am glad to see anything done that will increase the usefulness of the Congested Districts Board, and I can understand that there should be some advantage in associating with the inquiry one or two gentlemen who have experience as members of the Board.

The discussion which has taken place with regard to the *personnel* of the Commission is a good illustration of the difficulty which is always encountered by the Government of the day when it is called upon to bring together a Royal Commission. To my mind the ideal Commission is one composed of judicially-minded persons, one from which all partisans are excluded, and which corrects what one may call partisan information by means of the examination of witnesses; but, unluckily, that is not, as a general rule, the practice which is pursued. As a rule our Commissions are made up of representatives taken from both camps if there are two, and from three or four camps if there are three or four cleavages of opinion. The result is not altogether satisfactory. We often get a Report which bears on every line of it the evidence of unsatisfactory compromise, or if that does not happen, we get what Mr. Gladstone once described as a litter of Reports.

The difficulty to which I am referring presents itself in an acute form in Ireland, where every one who has opinions worth considering is either a partisan or is regarded as a partisan by his neighbours. It is extremely difficult in Ireland to get together a body of gentlemen whose findings would be regarded by the general public as entirely beyond suspicion. I therefore do not blame His Majesty's Government for selecting Commissioners committed to certain views as to the questions at issue. Some of their selections seem to me to have been most judicious. Several noble Lords have already borne witness to Sir John Colomb's ability and industry, and I rejoice to think that so able a public servant as Sir Francis Mowatt should be associated with him. But I am bound to say also, after listening to the speeches of my noble friends, that in some points this Commission is not as satisfactorily constituted as it might have been in regard both to those who are included in its number and those who are excluded from the body.

I do not think the defence made by the noble Earl who has just spoken of Mr. Conor O'Kelly's previous conduct was a very emergetic or convincing one. I cannot help thinking that his name might have been omitted with advantage. I cannot help saying, also, that the Commission would have been stronger in the public confidence it would have commanded, if, at all events, one or two representatives of those western landlords, who will be so largely affected by the finding, had been added to the number of the Commissioners.

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 23rd July, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords]. To be read the third time To-morrow.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords]. Read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Crediton Gas Bill [Lords]; Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Truro Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Nettlebed and District Commons Bill [Lords]; Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON AND CHATHAM RAILWAY BILL.

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) said he had intended on the part of the City Corporation further to oppose this Bill with a view of having considered the condition of Ludgate Hill Station, but the company had approached him and had promised to submit to the Corporation in the autumn a scheme with plans for the improvement of the station. That being so, he would not now further oppose the Bill, bearing in mind the period of the session and the fact that the Corporation had no desire to defeat this particular Bill.

Bill as amended, considered; to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill, without Amendment.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill; Bacup Corporation Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION ENGLAND AND WALES BILL.

Petition from Leicester, against; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA (CONSTITUTIONS OF TRANSVAAL AND THE ORANGE RIVER COLONIES).

Petition from Cape Colony, for enfranchisement of the coloured races; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATAL.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Native Disturbances in Natal [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH GUIANA.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Disturbances in British Guiana [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3676 to 3678 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MOTOR CARS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars. Vol. I., Report. Vol. II., Minutes of Evidence, with Appendices and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated July 19th, 1906, providing for Special Grants in aid of certain School Boards in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Copies presented, of Royal Warrants, dated September 16th, 1905, and June 6th, 1906, amending the Statutes of the University [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered July 3rd; *Mr. John O'Connor*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.]

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT (FRESCOES).

Copy presented, of Further Memoranda by Professor Church, F.R.S., concerning the Wall Paintings in the Palace of Westminster [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return ordered, "(1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th Day of November, 1905; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to Depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to Depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer at the 20th day of November, 1905; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on the 20th day of November; 1905; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of Depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic. c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks as well as the number and amount of Depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom: and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1905, showing the total number of Depositors in Trustee Savings Banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 275, of Session 1905)."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Overtime and Sunday Duty in London Telephone Department.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the new duty has been instituted in the London Telephone Department, whereby a number of women operators are instructed to hold themselves in readiness for work on Sundays, and consequently are compelled to remain at home, awaiting an urgent summons for duty; and will he say whether any payment is made to the operators thus listed for duty; and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of giving some remuneration to these emergency operators.

MR. STEADMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that restrictions are placed upon the obtaining of substitutes for Sunday duty among the women telephonists in London; and whether he will give instructions that owing to the nature of this duty the fullest liberty shall be given to the women to obtain exchanges of duty or substitution for Sunday work.

MR. STEADMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that female telephone operators in London are frequently kept on overtime for long periods without notice being given to them; whether he will issue instructions that the women may be warned in advance in order that they may make arrangements; and whether he will state the number of hours' overtime performed by women telephonists in London during the past twelve weeks.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It will be convenient, I think, that I should answer the hon. Member's three Questions together. The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that a new duty has been instituted in connection with Sunday work in the London Telephone Department. Every telephone operator is engaged on the understanding that she shall take her share in Sunday duty. This is a necessary incident of the work, and I do not think it is advisable that any payment should be made unless the operator is called upon for actual duty. No restrictions are placed in the way of obtaining substitutes for Sunday duty, except such as are made to secure that an operator should not be called upon for duty on two successive Sundays, and that the Department should not be called upon to pay a larger sum for the substitute than would be paid for the operator whose turn it originally was to perform Sunday duty. As regards the third Question, operators are given as long notice as possible when they are required to work overtime; but it is sometimes impossible to determine until the time arrives whether overtime work will be necessary. The number of hours of extra duty, exclusive of Sunday duty, performed by women telephonists in London during the twelve weeks ended July 6th last was 2,060. But this amount of overtime was due to exceptional causes, and I hope it may be possible, as these causes disappear, to reduce overtime to a minimum.

London Postmen and County Council Elections.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is now in a position to make such alterations in the regulations governing London postmen that will permit them to exercise ordinary civil rights in connection with county council elections.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I had intended to deal with the Question of the present regulations which prohibit postal servants from taking any part in county council elections. I found, however, that the Committee on Post Office Servants was taking evidence in regard to the whole question of civil rights, and under these circumstances I think it well to postpone action for the present. I believe that no county council elections will take place until next spring.

Employment of Children Act—By-laws for the County of London.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when he proposes to sanction the by-laws for the county of London under the Employment of Children Act, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have every hope that a settlement will be reached this week. If so, my formal sanction will follow as soon as the provisions of Section 4 of the Act have been complied with.

Delay in Telegraphing Mr. Haldane's Speech to Norwich.

MR. TILLETT (Norwich): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the delay which took place in transmitting to the provincial newspapers the statement made by the Secretary of State for War in the House on Thursday, the 12th July; whether he is aware that, although the first portion of the message was handed in at 6.7 p m., the first line of the speech of the Secretary of State for War was not received at the Norwich post office until 10.59 p.m.; and whether his department will take steps to avoid such delays in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not aware of any general delay in transmitting the speech to the provincial newspapers, but it is unfortunately the case that the report for a Norwich newspaper was overlooked at the Central Telegraph Office and not discovered until application was made for it. There was great pressure of business at the time, and this newspaper was one of a number included in a list of newspapers furnished by a press agency to each of which a copy of the report was to be sent. The other copies were, so far as I know, received in due course.

Commissioners for Publishing the Ancient Laws of Ireland.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the present Commissioners for publishing the ancient laws of Ireland showing, in respect of each, the date of appointment, qualification (if any) as Gaelic scholar, and, in the absence of such qualification, reason for appointment; and whether, in view of the criticism to which the work of this Commission has been subjected, he will consider the advisability of withdrawing the Commission and afterwards setting up a new Commission selected from among qualified Gaelic scholars, and provided with adequate means for making the laws and literature of ancient Ireland available to the present generation.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commission for the publication of the ancient laws and institutes of Ireland, having finished its labours, has ceased to exist. It was originally appointed in 1852, and was reconstituted in 1883. It presented its Report on June 18th, 1902, which shows that it had then completed its work of transcribing, translating, and publishing the ancient laws of Ireland, commonly called the Brehon laws. The Report, which was presented to Parliament, bears the No. [Cd. 1172] of the year 1902. As to the editing and publication of other ancient manuscripts relating to Ireland, I beg to refer to my Answer to the hon. Baronet the Member for North Wexford on June 25th. † The whole subject is under consideration.

Translation of Ancient Laws of Ireland.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has yet had time to make himself acquainted with the quantity of the ancient Irish literature still in manuscript untranslated; if he is aware of the character of some translations that have been made, and, especially the necessity for a new translation of the ancient laws of Ireland; and if, in view of the interest in archaic Celtic, especially Gaelic, literature, and the magnitude and importance of the work, he will consider the preparation of a scheme for having it undertaken on an adequate scale by the State with the voluntary co-operation of the best Celtic societies and scholars.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 593.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have not had time since I entered upon office to study ancient Celtic or, indeed, any other literature; but I am aware that there is a great deal of ancient Irish literature still in manuscript untranslated, and that some translations which have been made are deemed unsatisfactory. I believe that it would be desirable to have, not only a new translation, but a new critical edition in the original of the ancient Brehon laws. The scholars who produced the existing translation were naturally hampered by the difficulty of attaching definite values to ancient and obscure legal terms, and it is, I am informed, still doubtful whether the progress of linguistic research in that direction has reached a stage which would enable these difficulties to be overcome. I am, however, entirely disposed to consider a scheme for having the work undertaken on a large scale, but this would involve considerable expense. The Irish Government has no funds available for the purpose, and it would be necessary to obtain them from the Exchequer. It would, moreover, be necessary to consult the Royal Irish Academy, and possibly the British Academy also, upon the subject.

Discharges from Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the House the number of discharges which have taken place from the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, during the last four years, viz, engineers, skilled machinists, labourers, and general labourers, and the number of officials and clerical staff during the same period.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Number of Officials and Clerical Staff who have left the Ordnance Factories, Royal Arsenal, during each of the four years ending 31st March, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906.

Classes included.	Year ended March 31st.			
	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
Chief superintendent, military assistants, civil assistant, mechanical engineers, superintendents, assistant superintendents, danger building officers, surveyors, and clerical establishment - - - - - - -	3	6	4	3
Managers, assistant managers, chief draughtsman, chief designer, shop managers, supervisors, principal foremen, foremen, and assistant foremen - - - - - - -	11	18	20	25
Writers (including principal foremen and foremen writers), draughtsmen, work-takers, book-keepers, rate fixers, storemen, timekeepers, messengers, and warders - - -	57	46	29	42
Totals - -	71	70	53	70

Number of Discharges of Adult Workmen during each of the four years ending March 31st, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906.

Year ended March 31st.	Artificers, including Fitters, Turners, and Skilled Tradesmen generally.					Machinists.					Skilled Labourers					Unskilled Labourers.					Total.
	Reduction.	Voluntary.	Misconduct.	Other Causes.	Total.	Reduction.	Voluntary.	Misconduct.	Other Causes.	Total.	Reduction.	Voluntary.	Misconduct.	Other Causes.	Total.	Reduction.	Voluntary.	Misconduct.	Other Causes.	Total.	
1903	456	107	52	61	676	143	21	6	10	180	288	190	89	97	664	945	241	62	61	1,309	2,828
1904	468	79	32	82	661	23	10	6	7	46	380	139	71	58	648	170	110	30	88	398	1,753
1905	413	74	25	79	591	120	10	4	8	142	168	82	39	46	335	291	71	29	53	444	1,512
1905	209	85	23	72	389	62	8	5	7	82	199	65	27	46	337	376	38	13	34	461	1,269

Taxing of Motor Cars.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will consider the expediency of placing a tax on motor cars on a scale rising in proportion to their horse-power.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The question of the taxation of motor cars will come up for consideration when the Report of the Royal Commission is in the hands of the Government. In the meantime it would be premature to make any statement on the subject.

Representation of the Central Provinces on the Legislative Council of India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that in 1903 the Government of India, complying with the prayer of sundry memorials from the people of the Central Provinces, were pleased to accord to district boards and municipalities the privilege of recommending one nominee to a seat on the Legislative Council of the Government of India, and to the fact that this privilege is now held in abeyance, and that an official was lately appointed to represent the Central Provinces in the Council, he will move the Government of India to accede to the request of the local provincial conferences of 1905 and 1906, and restore to the district boards and municipalities of the Central Provinces and Berar the privilege of recommending a provincial representative on the Legislative Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I expect before long to receive a communication from the Government of India.

Church of Scotland Services for Royal Scots Regiment at Bombay.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the licence given by the Bishop of Bombay to the regiment of Royal Scots to use the garrison church at Colaba for religious services according to the forms of the Church of Scotland expires in October next; and, if so, whether the Government in India will arrange to have it renewed for the period in which the Royal Scots are quartered in Bombay.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) As I stated in answer to the hon. Member's Question on May 28th,† the arrangement for the use of the church at Colaba for Presbyterian services terminates in October. During the cold weather I understand that the Scottish troops at Colaba will use the Scottish church in the fort at Bombay, distant about two miles from their barracks.

Irish National Education—"Two-Teacher Schools."

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is meant by a two-teacher school under the Irish National Board, or does it mean a school having a certificated teacher and a junior literary assistant.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that a two-teacher school is one with a principal and assistant teacher, or with a principal and a junior assistant mistress.

Irish Education Code—Rule 127 (b).

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is rule 127 (b) as yet in existence in the Code of the Irish National Education Commissioners; is he aware that National school managers have in most parts of Ireland condemned it as being totally unsuited to the requirements of the children attending their schools; and will he recommend the Commissioners to do away with the rule altogether.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the rule referred to is still in existence. As to the remainder of the Question, I beg to refer to my Answer to the Question of the hon. Member for West Wicklow on February 21st last,‡ to which I have nothing to add.

Sale of the Earl of Dunraven's Estates.

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say whether the Earl of Dunraven, having sold his estates around Adare, Croom, and the adjoining districts to the farming tenants occupying same, has as yet sold to the town tenants in

---

* See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 64.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clii., 352.

Croom and Adare, and, if so, on what terms; can he say whether the Earl of Dunraven holds any untenanted lands at the Carrigeens, west of Croom, on which the labourers and the landless people of that locality may be quartered; and have the evicted tenants Messrs. Ryan, Cronin, and the others lately allowed back into possession of their farms as yet received any aid to rebuild their houses and restock their lands from the Estates Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that proceedings for the sale of the village holdings in Croom and Adare on the estate of the Earl of Dunraven have not yet been instituted before them. The Commissioners, however, understand that Lord Dunraven proposes to offer for sale to them his Croom village property and his untenanted lands at Carrigeen. The Commissioners have sanctioned grants for stock or buildings to Messrs. Ryan and Cronin, and three other evicted tenants who have been restored, and the administration of these grants is at present in the hands of their inspectors.

Appointment of Mr. Vereker to Congested Districts Board.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give the date of the appointment of Mr. Vereker, as an official of the Congested Districts Board; the date he surrendered his agencies and receiverships; the name of the person on whose recommendation he was appointed; and whether the appointment is of a permanent or temporary character.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that Mr. Vereker was appointed to the post of assistant chief land inspector on September 1st, 1904. Mr. Vereker at once resigned his agencies, and undertook to give his entire time to the Board's service; but, with their approval, he continued to act nominally as receiver for the O'Donel Estate, upon the condition that the duties would be performed by a deputy except as regards the signing of accounts. The Land Judge did not consider it advisable that Mr. Vereker should be discharged as receiver when he entered the Board's service, and the petitioner's solicitors opposed the discharge on the ground of needless expense. Mr. Vereker was eventually discharged in August, 1905. He did not receive fees or payment of any kind for acting as receiver after he entered the Board's service. Recommendations received by the Board are treated confidentially. Mr. Vereker's appointment is temporary, as are all other appointments made by the Board.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it was upon the recommendation of Mr. Henry R. Vereker, land agent and receiver, that the Congested Districts Board advanced large sums of money for the purpose of enabling poor tenants on the Stoney Estate to emigrate to America; that that gentleman has caused such distrust in the minds of the people that there is a growing feeling of uneasiness amongst them; and whether he will transfer him to some other department where he will not be brought into contact with the tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) As I informed the hon. Member on Thursday last, Mr. Vereker has had nothing whatever to do with the operations of the Congested Districts Board in connection with the Stoney Estate. This being so, there is, in the Board's opinion, no reason for any feelings of mistrust or uneasiness on the part of the tenants with regard to Mr. Vereker, and the Board see no reason for making any change in respect of Mr. Vereker's appointment or duties.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Henry R. Vereker, who was appointed assistant land valuer by the Congested Districts Board, had been for many years agent on the Stoney Estate, near Newport, the Pike Estate in Achill, and receiver on other estates in county Mayo; and whether, seeing that the people of the West have no confidence in the Board since his appointment, he will discontinue the services of this gentleman.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Mr. Vereker was agent of the Stoney Estate and receiver for the O'Donel Estate. The Congested Districts Board highly appreciate Mr. Vereker's services. They are not aware and do not believe that the people of the West have lost confidence either in him or in the Board themselves.

Irish Education—Security of Tenure of Protestant Teachers.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have refused to deal with the request for security of tenure made by the Protestant National Teachers' Union; and whether he proposes to introduce any legislation dealing with the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the question of security of tenure was the subject of memorials received from the Protestant National Teachers' Union both in 1895 and in 1901. The Commissioners decided in 1895 that it was not expedient for them to initiate the discussion of an important change in their rules affecting the relations between managers and teachers and adhered to this decision in 1901. The Commissioners have recently received a series of Resolutions on the subject passed by the same organisation, but these Resolutions have not yet been considered. I am not as at present advised prepared to undertake to introduce a measure on the subject. The matter appears to me to be mainly one for the consideration of the Commissioners themselves.

Dublin Corporation—Charges of Corruption.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at a meeting of the Corporation of Dublin, on Monday last, whereat charges of curruption were brought against certain members; and whether, in the interests of the ratepayers of Dublin, he will advise the appointment of a Royal Commission of inquiry into the administration of the affairs of the city by the corporation.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have no knowledge of the proceedings referred to beyond that which I have gathered from the newspapers. I am not aware of any eason or supposing that the interests of the ratepayers are at present insufficiently safeguarded. There is no intention of appointing any Commission to inquire into the matter.

Shooting of Fowls by Major O'Connor at Douglas, County Cork.

Mr. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings of the Petty Sessions Court, held at Douglas, county Cork, on Monday, the 9th instant, at which eight magistrates attended to try a case in which Major O'Connor, a brother justice, was prosecuted for shooting a prize fowl, the property of Mrs. Forde, and to the fact that the majority of the justices dismissed the case notwithstanding the fact that the defendant admitted the offence; and whether, under the circumstances, he will bring the conduct of those justices under the notice of the Lord Chancellor.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that in the case referred to the magistrates by a majority dismissed the complaint. It appears to have been proved that the fowl was trespassing in Major O'Connor's garden when he shot it, and that Major O'Connor had previously cautioned the owner against such trespass; and a case was quoted in which the Superior Courts decided that in such circumstances no offence under the Malicious Injuries Act is committed. If the owner is dissatisfied with the judicial decision of the magistrates it is, I presume, open to him to take such further legal proceedings as he may be advised. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the negotiations between the Treasury and the Irish Agriculture Department as to extend facilities for increased areas for tobacco cultivation in Ireland will be terminated.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I understand that the decision of the Treasury upon the proposals which have been made by the Department of Agriculture will be communicated to the Department in the course of a few days.

Evicted Tenants on Major Chearnley's Estate, County Waterford.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Major Chearnley has recently evicted James Keane from his holding at Mountain Castle, near Cappoquin, county Waterford; and whether the Estates Commissioners, in the case of the sale of the estate of Major Chearnley, will take steps to restore the evicted tenant, and will not sanction an advance exceeding £500 for the purchase of the holding to any other person.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have no knowledge of the eviction referred to, and have received no application for reinstatement from James Keane. If such an application should be lodged, the Commissioners will have the case inquired into in due course.

Irish School Teachers' Examination—Publication of Marks Obtained.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether candidates for examinations necessary to qualify them as teachers under the National Education Commissioners are not informed, even when a special request is made, of the marks they have obtained, but are only informed of the grade obtained, whether first, second, or third; and whether he will recommend that the example of the Intermediate Education Board and of the Royal University should be followed by the National Education Commissioners, in giving this information to candidates in training for the most important positions under the National Education Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that it was formerly their custom to supply candidates at the annual examinations for teachers with details of their marks in the various subjects of the programme. This practice not only caused delay in the notification of the results, but also led to very great inconvenience in other respects, and the Commissioners found it necessary to discontinue the practice. Successful candidates are now arranged in three divisions, and are notified of the division in which they pass.

Irish School Inspectors—Intimation to Managers of Intended Visits.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether inspectors of national schools in Ireland are bound on any occasions to notify managers of their intention to visit their schools, and, if so, on what occasions; and, in regard to this matter, what has been the practice of inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) It is prescribed by the Commissioners' rules that inspectors should not give any intimation of their intended visits except when they propose to hold a formal inspection. Inspectors, however, are instructed that when they visit a school with the intention of spending a considerable time at it they should cause the manager to be notified of their arrival, even though they may not hold a formal inspection. If the manager should reside at a considerable distance, the inspector may send to him a notification by post so as to reach him on the morning of inspection. The Commissioners inform me that they have no reason to doubt that these directions are duly observed.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Mr. Peter M'Taggart on the Sankey Estate.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Mr. Peter M'Taggart, who was evicted from his holding in Derrycasson, on the Sankey Estate, county Cavan, in 1901; will he say whether this estate is being sold, and whether the evicted farm is on the landlord's hands, and what steps the Estates Commissioners are taking.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received the application referred to. No proceedings for the sale of the estate on which the evicted farm is situate have been instituted before the Commissioners. The farm is stated to be in the occupation of a new tenant. The Commissioners will have the evicted tenant's application inquired into in due course.

Reinstatement of Mrs. Ellen Reilly on the Lloyd Estate.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received a petition from the Nationalist tenants on the Lloyd estate, county Cavan, praying for the reinstatement of Mrs. Ellen Reilly, the daughter of Charles Maguire, who was evicted in 1886 from his holding in Drummore by the landlord for non-payment of one year's rent; will he say whether this farm is on the landlord's hands; and, if not, who holds it; also when tenancy was created, and what was the consideration; what steps do the Estates Commissioners propose to take in this case; and will the sale of the estate be carried through if only a portion of the tenants purchase on terms excluding the restoration of the evicted tenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that Mrs. Reilly's application and all papers in the case are at present in the hands of their inspector who has been directed to inquire into it. The farm is stated to be in the hands of the owner, but the Commissioners are unable to make any definite statement upon this or any of the points mentioned in the Question until the inspector's report has been received and considered.

Extra Police at Drumkeerin and Dowra, County Leitrim.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a large force of extra police was drafted into the village of Drumkeerin, county Leitrim, on the 7th instant; that portion of this force proceeded on the 9th instant to Dowra for the purpose of interfering with the right of the people to hold a public meeting; and seeing that the police wantonly attacked some people remaining in the village after the meeting, will he state the reason for the presence of extra police in a district which is free from crime, and how it is intended to defray their expenses.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) A force of thirty extra policemen was drafted into Drumkeerin on the evening of 7th instant for the purpose of preserving the peace and preventing intimidation. Earlier on that day assaults had been committed upon the local police and others, and several of the offenders have since been returned for trial at assizes. On 9th instant a portion of the force proceeded to Dowra, not for the purpose of interfering with any public meeting, but with the object of preventing further acts of intimidation by a large crowd which had assembled. Owing to the threatening attitude of the crowd the district inspector found it necessary to disperse them. The expense of the extra force will be defrayed from the Constabulary Vote, as the force was drawn from the county establishment.

Sale of the Goold Versehoyle Estate, County Limerick.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Goold Versehoyle Estate at Athen, in the county of Limerick, has been sold to the Estates Commissioners under the Land Act, 1903; that there are ten tenants on that estate who have refused to sign purchase agreements because the landlord is demanding exorbitant prices from them; and whether the Estates Commissioners will inquire into their case before paying the purchase money.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that proceedings have been instituted before them for the sale of this estate to the tenants direct. The Commissioners will, before sanctioning the advances applied for, inquire into the cases of those tenants who have refused to sign agreements for purchase.

Sale of the Cusack Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the approximate date at which the Estates Commissioners hope to be put in possession of the Cusack (county Longford) Estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are not yet in a position to say when they will be placed in possession of the estate in question. Their offer to purchase, which was accepted by the Land Judge, was subject to a condition which has not yet been satisfied, namely, the condition that they should be able to procure, from suitable persons, undertakings to repurchase from them the untenanted lands comprised in the proposals. The Commissioners will see that there is no undue delay in dealing with the matter.

Sale of the Clonfin Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any reply has been received from the solicitors, Messrs. Mecredy and Son, having charge of the Clonfin Estate in county Longford; and, if so, will he give the purport of same.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that on the 11th instant they received a reply from the firm of solicitors mentioned to the effect that they were in communication with the owners as to the possibility of a sale and would inform the Commissioners of the result in due course. The Commissioners have received no further reply.

Report of the Poor Law Commission.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state when the Report of the Poor Law Commission will be issued; and if he can give any explanation of the delay in publication, having regard to the fact that the terms of the Report have been long since agreed to.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have communicated with the Chairman of the Commission, and am informed that the Commissioners hope to present their Report at an early date, but cannot yet fix the precise day. I indicated some little time ago that the Commissioners had not then agreed upon quite all the questions which must be dealt with in their Report. I understand, however, that they are now agreed as to the large majority of the recommendations to be made. The time seems to be approaching when the Commissioners must be asked if they cannot forthwith arrive at unanimity, to consider the question of submitting their Report, with a memorandum from any dissenting Commissioner stating the points upon which he may not be in accord with his colleagues.

Report of Local Government Board (Ireland).

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can explain the delay in the publication of the Report of the Local Government Board for 1905; and why, although repeated promises have been made to expedite the publication of these Reports, they are still delayed for considerable periods.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Report of the Local Government Board for the year ending March 31st, 1906, is in the printer's hands and will be presented to Parliament in the course of a few days. There has been no delay in the matter. It is to be remembered that the Report cannot be prepared until the books and accounts of the local authorities for the year under review have been closed, and until the necessary particulars for the Report and appendices have been abstracted therefrom. The Report is ready this year earlier than ever before, and it would be quite impossible for the Board to present it earlier in any future year.

Government Grant to Unemployed—Equivalent Grant to Ireland.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what equivalent grant has been obtained in respect of the £200,000 granted for the unemployed in England and Wales.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I understand from the President of the Local Government Board that the proposed grant of £200,000 is to be applied to the purposes of the Unemployed Workmen Act throughout the United Kingdom. The proportion to be allocated to Ireland has not yet been determined, but I am in communication with my right hon. friend upon the subject.

12th of July Celebrations in Ulster.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any serious case of a breach of the peace occurred during the 12th of July celebrations in Ulster.

(*Answered by Mr Bryce*): The Inspector-General of Constabulary informs me that only one serious breach of the peace has been reported in connection with the recent 12th of July celebrations. It must, however, be added that the risk of such breaches was in several cases averted only by the constant exertions of the police authorities, whose tact I gladly acknowledge, and that considerable expense was incurred in moving bodies of police to the points where the risk was greatest.

Grievances of Senior Reserve Officers who served during South African War.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he proposes to take any steps to inquire into the alleged grievances of the senior Reserve officers who were called up for service during the late war in South Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The case of these officers has recently again received very thorough consideration, and I cannot undertake again to reopen the whole question.

New Army Scheme—Infantry Soldiers Passing Annually into the Reserve.

COLONEL LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham): To ask the Secretary of State for War what number of infantry soldiers it is calculated will pass into the Army Reserve annually from the Regular Army under the new organisation proposed, and how many from Militia, if any.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The normal transfers to the Army Reserve under the new system will be for the Foot Guards, 893, and for Infantry of the Line, 10,738. It is not possible at the present time to give any information as regards the Militia.

Artillery Gunners and Drivers passing Annually into the Reserve.

COLONEL LONG: To ask the Secretary of State for War what number of artillery gunners and drivers, respectively, it is calculated will pass into the Army Reserve annually from the regular Horse and Field Artillery under the new organisation proposed, and how many from the Militia.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The annual transfers to the Reserve would be as follows:—

	Gunners.	Drivers.
Royal Horse Artillery - -	173	104
Royal Field Artillery - -	773	498

It is not possible to give any information as regards the Militia

South-East of Scotland Militia Artillery and Fife Artilley—Taking over of Equipment.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that the camp equipment used by the South-east of Scotland Militia Artillery at Dunbar was returned to Stirling, and fresh equipment issued from Stirling to the Fife Artillery, which has succeeded the above-named regiment at Dunbar; and whether he will consider the advisability of saving the transport of some 15 to 20 tons of equipment, and all the time and expense involved, by arranging that one regiment shall take over equipment from another in such circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The actual weight of stores sent to Dunbar for the Fife Artillery was 12 tons, of which four tons were bedding needing exchange. The matter appears to have arisen from a local misunderstanding, which has been inquired into and is being dealt with by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief.

Suggested Increase of Army Pension for Thomas Loughlin, late 55th Regiment.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that Thomas Loughlin joined the 55th Regiment of Infantry on the 3rd of March 1855, Regimental No. 3891, served in the Crimea until the conclusion of hostilities, was invalided in June 1859 on a pension of 6d. a day, and being now over 70 years of age and unable to supplement his pension by work, he can see his way to grant Loughlin some increase of his pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This man served for four years fifty-seven days only and was invalided for chronic varicose ulcers of the left leg. He did not land in the Crimea until the 24th October 1855, and consequently did not become entitled to a war medal. His present pension of sixpence a day is the highest for which he is eligible under the regulations.

Increased Imports of Spirituous Liquors into the Sudan.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received the information regarding the increase of spirituous liquors imported into the Sudan during the years 1900 to 1905, which he promised to ask for; and, if not, whether this information may be expected before the adjournment of Parliament.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I have not yet received the information for which I asked on 13th June. It has, no doubt, been necessary to refer the Question to Khartoum, and I cannot say whether it will be received before the adjournment.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will procure from the Government of the Sudan a copy of the existing regulations for controlling and licensing the import and sale of alcoholic liquors in their territory, and also information as to the extent to which these regulations are operative.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I will ask for the information desired by the hon. Member.

The Central Telegraph Office and Naval Manœuvres Telegrams.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Postmaster-General whether arrangements were made in the Telegraph Department in connection with the recent naval manœuvres, for the purpose of keeping all the signalling stations round the coast in communication with headquarters; whether he is aware that after 10 p.m. on several occasions, messages for transmission from the Admiralty to a number of places were delayed two or three hours in the Central Telegraph Office, London; and whether he can state the cause of this defective organisation.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Special arrangements were made according to the wishes of the Admiralty, and the Central Exchange Office dealt with about 28,500 telegrams in connection with the manœuvres. The Admiralty have signified to me their appreciation of the high efficiency shown by the officers detailed by the Post Office. Further, on seeing the hon. Member's Question, they have informed me that they are not aware of any such delay as that mentioned as having taken place, and no such delay is recorded at the Central Telegraph Office.

Delivery of Letters from Thurso to Tongue.

MR. R. L. HARMSWORTH (Caithnessshire): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, while there is a conveyance carrying the mails on every week-day from Thurso, in the county of Caithness, to Betty Hill, in the county of Sutherland, letters from Thurso to Tongue and surrounding districts situated about twelve miles beyond Betty Hill are only forwarded on four days of the week; and whether he will give instructions that letters from Thurso to Tongue will hereafter be forwarded on every day of the week.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is already a service from Thurso to Tongue on four days a week; on the other three days a week the letters to Tongue come down *via* Lairg. The cost of the existing service is unduly high in proportion to the amount of correspondence, and the additional two days service from Thurso to Tongue would only benefit a few local letters forming a very small percentage of the whole. I regret that I am unable to accede to the hon. Member's request.

Postal Deliveries of Letters at Curaheen, near Nenagh.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the people of Curaheen, near Nenagh, a populous district, have only one delivery of letters in the week; that they are inconvenienced from time to time owing to the delay attending the delivery of correspondence; that the neighbouring townland of Gurtgarry has five deliveries weekly, although the former district is much more populous and important; and if so, whether he will make arrangements to have as many deliveries weekly in Curaheen.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have at present no information on the subject, but I will call for a Report and will communicate with the hon. Member in due course.

Housing Question—Compulsory Registration of Title.

MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham): To ask Mr. Attorney-General if his attention has been called to the evidence given by Mr. C. F. Brickdale, the Registrar of the Land Registry, before the Committee on the Housing Question, in favour of making registration of title generally compulsory; and whether he will consider the desirability of holding an inquiry into the working of the compulsory system in the county of London before it is extended.

(*Answered by Sir John Walton.*) I shall be glad to consider the desirability of the inquiry suggested before the step referred to is taken.

Sentences of Imprisonment on Males over 21 years of age.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many separate sentences of imprisonment have been passed in the last twelve months for which statistics are available upon males over the age of 21 in England and Wales, and the total number of the male population in England and Wales over the age of twenty, and the ratio per thousand of the first-class to the second.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The exact number of such sentences cannot be given, but the number of convicted male prisoners of the age of twenty-one or over received in prison during the year ended 31st March last was 130,770. This number includes prisoners who were committed to prison in default of paying fines, as well as those who were sentenced to imprisonment without the option of a fine. The male population of England and Wales over the age of twenty years, according to the the last census (1901), was 9,103,260, thus giving a ratio of 14·3 convicted prisoners per 1,000 of population, but it has to be borne in mind that when the same person is received in prison several times during the year (as happens in a large number of cases) he is counted each time as a convicted prisoner.

Twickenham Urban District Council and Religious Denomination of Teachers.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he is aware that on the printed application forms issued by the Twickenham Urban District Council, when about to consider the appointment of a teacher, a query appears as to the teachers' religious denomination; and whether he proposes to communicate with the Twickenham Urban District Council upon the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not aware of the practice referred to, nor am I able to intervene in regard to it, as I do not see that it contravenes the present law.

South Kensington Museum—Loans of Works of Art.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can so alter the conditions under which works of art are lent from the South Kensington Museum that students and connoisseurs may be certain of finding complete series of the best examples of the applied arts always at South Kensington.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) If the hon. Member will communicate with me as to the precise difficulty to which he refers, I will see what can be done to prevent its recurrence.

Pauper Lunatics Suffering from Effects of Alcohol.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the board of guardians of St. Giles', Camberwell, and approved by the board of guardians of St. Marylebone, to the effect that persons who have been admitted three times within twelve months to the lunatic wards of the workhouse owing to the effects of alcohol should be constituted offenders under the Inebriates Act, 1898; and whether the Government intend to propose legislation to carry out this suggestion.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received copies of the resolution referred to; but I cannot say more than that the suggestion will be carefully considered in connection with other proposed amendments of the Inebriates Act when there is an opportunity for legislation.

Irish National Education Commissioners.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland; who appoints them; and what is the authority under which such appointments are made; under what authority the present arrangement exists; and whether there is any authority for dismissing any or all of these Commissioners; and if so, in whose hands is such authority vested.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education in Ireland are a body corporate, established by a Charter issued in 1845, and a Supplemental Charter issued in 1861. Under the terms of these Charters each Commissioner is appointed by a warrant under the hand of the Lord-Lieutenant, and holds office during the pleasure of the Lord-Lieutenant. The following are the names of the existing Commissioners:—

Sir H. Bellingham, Bart.
Right Hon. C. Palles.
Rev. H. Evans, D.D.
Right Hon. Sir R. Blennerhasset, Bart.
His Honour Judge Shaw.
Rev. H. B. Wilson, D.D.
S. Harrington, Esq.
W. R. J. Molloy, Esq.
Right Rev. Bishop Archdall, D.D.
W. J. M. Starkie, Esq. M.A., D. Litt.
A. Traill, Esq., LL.D., M.D.
Lord Frederick Fitzgerald.
His Honour Judge Carton.
Rev. David A. Taylor.
Lord Killanin.
Most Rev. Bishop Foley, D.D.
E. J. Gwynn, Esq., M.A., F.T.C.D.
G. Dease, Esq., D.L.
The Right Hon. Mr. Justice Ross.
Richard Bagwell, Esq., D.L.

Religious Persuasions of Irish National School Inspectors.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether about one-half of the inspectors of schools under the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, are by arrangement non-Catholics, and the remainder Catholics; whether the power for nominating candidates for vacancies on these lines is in the hands of the Commissioners; whether promotions are also made on the same lines; if so, under what authority is this system in vogue; and, seeing that these inspectors have nothing to do with the particular form of religious instruction given in the national schools, whether he will consider the advisability of causing such vacancies to be filled by open competition in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that thirty-five of their inspectors are Roman Catholics out of a total of seventy-five. The Commissioners themselves made an arrangement many years ago that one half of the inspection staff should be Roman Catholics, but as the staff has been reduced since 1900, according as vacancies occurred, it has not been possible to maintain this precise proportion. The power of nominating candidates and of making promotion rests with the Commissioners acting upon their own authority. Vacancies in the inspection staff were for many years filled by limited competition, subject to the arrangement as to religion indicated, Owing to the redundancy of the staff no appointments have been made for some years past, and no regulations have yet been formulated by the Commissioners for the filling of vacancies which may arise in the future.

Payment of Damages by Constable Cryan.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say if Constable Cryan adheres to his offer to pay by instalments half of the damages, viz., £50, obtained against him and Constable

Masterton by Edward Carroll, Laeken, Rosenallis, Queen's County, for assault committed on 17th March 1905; and, if so, upon what terms, and upon what date the first instalment will be paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that he has communicated with Constable Cryan, who adheres to his offer to pay by instalments £50 of the damages awarded against him and ex-Constable Masterton at the suit of Edward Carroll. Constable Cryan states that he is prepared to pay instalments of £1 a month until the sum of £50 is paid; and that he will make the first payment on any date agreed upon with Mr. Carroll's solicitor.

Purchase of Captain Caldbeck's Estate—Village of Ballacolla.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say that in dealing with the estate of Captain Caldbeck, Ballacolla, Queen's County, the Estates Commissioners are prepared to purchase the village of Ballacolla for the purpose of sale to the tenants with the agricultural portion of the estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the documents and maps relating to this estate have been referred to their inspector, who has been directed to inquire into the matter. The lands comprised in the originating application include portion of the townland of Ballycolla; but in the absence of the documents and map the Commissioners are unable to say whether the village holdings are included in the proposed sale. The facts, however, will be ascertained upon inspection.

Irish Land Purchase—Receipts by Banks.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the difficulty caused to farmers, who have purchased their holdings under the recent Land Act, by the refusal of banks to give receipts for moneys paid into them on account of instalments due to the Irish Land Commission; and whether he will arrange with the banks concerned to issue temporary acknowledgments of moneys so paid in, as a voucher, until such times as the Estates Commissioners forward their official receipt.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Land Commissioners inform me that they do not consider that payers of land purchase annuities experience any such difficulty as the Question suggests. The Commissioners understand that in any case in which a payer desires to have an acknowledgment of the money lodged by him upon a receivable order, the banks make no difficulty about giving him such an acknowledgment.

Sale of Belfast Corporation Stock by Representatives of Deceased Person.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of a deceased person holding Belfast Corporation stock his legal representatives cannot sell or transfer such stock unless the grant of probate of his will has first been resealed in England; and whether, in view of the fact that this is necessary in the case of Belfast Corporation stock, and is not necessary in the case of any other corporation or other stock issued in Ireland, he will consider what steps he can take to alter this arrangement.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Local Government Board have no information that the fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. The Board consider that possibly the Question has been framed under a misconception. The Board understand that a London firm acts as registrar in respect of the latest large issue of Belfast Corporation stock, and that, consequently, the registrar could not make entries in his books of the sale or transfer of such stock standing in the name of a deceased person until the grant of probate to his will had been exhibited and the names of the legal representatives duly recorded in the stock ledgers. The Board are not aware that any resealing of probate is necessary, but in any event they have no authority to interfere in the matter.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Bermuda Floating Dock.

*MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on what date the Bermuda floating dock arrived at its destination; what armoured ships have been docked in it since then, exclusive of the vessels towing the dock out; and whether the Admiralty will endeavour to obtain some return for the large expenditure involved by bringing the dock back to England or to some place where it can be utilised.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, East Molton, for Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON): The new floating dock arrived at Bermuda on August 8th, 1902, and was moored in its permanent berth in June, 1905, since when the "Rupert" and "St. George" have been docked in it. Other dockings have been carried out in the old floating dock which is about to be sold. It is not considered desirable to leave Bermuda dockyard without a dock.

*MR. BELLAIRS: Is the "St. George" an armoured cruiser? I asked for rmoured vessels.

[No Answer was returned.]

Naval Base.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the experience gained during the recent naval manœuvres, the question of establishing a naval base at Invergordon, Cromarty Firth, will again be considered.

MR. LAMBERT: The Answer is in the negative.

Royal Arsenal, Woolwich.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): On behalf of the hon. Member for Woolwich, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the annual cost of the recently appointed officials, viz., shop managers, piece-rate fixers, and supervisors at the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): During 1905–6 the cost of the supervisors was £1,240 and the rate-fixers £2,573. The shop managers cannot be described as recently appointed officials as they replace officials called principal foremen on the same rate of pay; their cost during 1905–6 was £4,286.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: On behalf of the hon. Member for Woolwich I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the House the number of discharges which have taken place from the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, during the last four years, viz., engineers, skilled machinists, labourers, and general labourers, and the number of officials and clerical staff during the same period.

MR. HALDANE: The figures are too long to read out to the House, but I will have them printed in the Answer to the Question.†

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) asked if the right hon. Gentleman before making any further reduction, would also consider the case of private firms doing Government contract work. In his own constituency, for instance, hundreds of men had had to be discharged from such work.

MR. HALDANE said that of course their first duty was to keep their own establishment in efficient condition. Beyond that necessity they endeavoured to hold the balance equally as between Government and private establishments.

Army Reduction.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, how the Vote by Parliament of 203,000 men for the Army for the year 1906–7 will be affected by the reduction in men proposed to be made by the Government; how much will be saved out of the £29,796,000 voted for the Army Estimates for the year 1906–7; and how such saving will be treated.

MR. HALDANE: It is not possible at present to state by how many men the actual strength of the Army will be reduced during the current financial year or what savings will accrue in consequence.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of

---

† See Col. 680.

State for War if he will take care that all the expenses incurred by the officers of the abolished battalions in joining the battalions to which they may be posted are paid by the War Office, inclusive of rent of houses and moving of furniture in respect of married men, and of the cost of their new uniforms.

Mr. HALDANE: The position of all the officers concerned will be fully considered, but I am not now in a position to give any definite reply to the points raised in the Question.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: And will the cases of the married non-commissioned officers and men also be considered?

Mr. HALDANE: I can give no specific pledges just now. The whole of the circumstances are under consideration.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the 3rd and 4th battalions of the Northumberland Fusiliers, the Lancashire Fusiliers, the Manchester Regiment, the Royal Warwickshire Regiment, the 3rd Coldstream Guards, and the 3rd Scots Guards did not enlist in those battalions on a moral contract, that they should be allowed to complete their engagements therein; and if he will take care that no non-commissioned officer or soldier is transferred to any battalion not freely selected by himself.

Mr. HALDANE: If the hon. and gallant Member will kindly refer to Section 83 of the Army Act he will find that a man cannot be transferred to another regiment without his consent, except under certain special circumstances. I do not understand what the hon. and gallant Member means by a moral contract. I am not aware of any bargain of any sort or kind to the effect he suggests.

In reply to a further question by Sir Howard Vincent,

Mr. HALDANE was understood to say that he proposed to transfer men from one battalion to another, but not from one regiment to another, without their consent.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) asked whether men who could not be transferred to other battalions and declined to be transferred to other regiments would be permitted to leave the service.

Mr. HALDANE: We shall give them the option of going into the Reserve if they so wish.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, what is the exact sum he will save the country by the abolition of 20,000 men from the Regular Army; and how he proposes to provide for the civil employment of the 20,000 thus dismissed, or the 20,000 recruits who hoped to serve the State as a means of honourable livelihood.

Mr. HALDANE: The sum which will be saved is likely to be very substantial, but, as I have already indicated, I ask the House not to press me for a figure which can only be finally ascertained and stated with confidence when the Estimates as a whole are reviewed. As regards the last part of the Question there is no intention of dismissing 20,000 men. Such men as are redundant will be gradually absorbed or passed prematurely to the Reserve with their own consent.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Has any calculation been made of the saving.

Mr. HALDANE: We have been engaged in doing very little else.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Is it worth doing at all?

Mr. HALDANE: Perfectly well worth doing.

Tinned Foods for the Army.

Mr. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a case in which Messrs. R. Dickeson and Co., Limited, army contractors, were prosecuted for supplying putrid tinned food for sale in regimental canteens; and whether he will prohibit any military authorities dealing with this firm until some responsible authority, like a medical officer of health, employed by a borough council, has visited their stores, sampled their goods, and reported in such a manner as will allay the anxiety of all interested in the question of a pure food supply for the troops.

MR. HALDANE: The management of canteens is delegated to General Officers Commanding and the contracts are made locally. Messrs. Dickeson hold contracts for the supply of groceries at a few military stations. The articles supplied under these contracts are submitted to the inspection of expert officers. No complaints of their quality have been received and it is not proposed to interfere with these contracts. But I must add that the attention of the General Officers Commanding will be drawn to the case referred to in the Question.

MR. LEA: Who are the expert officers who supervise these contracts?

MR. HALDANE: They are officers specially trained for the purpose.

Ceylon Duties on Indian Tea.

*__MR. REES__ (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what has been the result of the further consideration the Government of Ceylon was invited, during the early part of this session, to give to the proposed abolition of the import duty levied in Ceylon upon Indian tea.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The views of the Ceylon Government have not yet been received, but their attention has again been drawn to the matter.

*__MR. REES__: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that India is denied free entry into Ceylon, while the Crown Colony imports two million pounds of tea annually into India?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir, the whole matter is under consideration.

South Africa—Imports of Skimmed Milk.

MR. WILLS (Dorsetshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the sudden prohibition of the importation of skimmed milk into South Africa by the imposition of a duty of 200 per cent. on the landed value has injured British firms in the trade, whose commitments are necessarily made some ten months ahead, and caused loss of a market for their by-product to British and Irish farmers, and deprived the inhabitants of South Africa of a cheap and wholesome form of food; and whether he will take steps to bring these grievances to the notice of the South African Customs Union with a view to their removal.

MR. CHURCHILL: The representations made by the exporters of skimmed milk have been forwarded to the High Commissioner for South Africa for the consideration of the respective Colonial Governments, and the Secretary of State has thus already taken the only action which is open to him in the matter.

Gwelo Diamond Discovery.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is aware that a highly payable diamond area has been discovered near Gwelo, in Rhodesia; that the Chartered Company have issued a proclamation forbidding pegging or prospecting on said area; that in direct defiance of this notice men have been pegging and prospecting there; that these men are armed and openly announce their intention of remaining in spite of the Company, and their resolve should force be used to use force also; and what action he proposes to take in this matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: It appears to be the fact that diamonds have been discovered in the neighbourhood of Gwelo. The Administration of Southern Rhodesia on April 14th last, issued a Government notice to the effect that a defined area in the Gwelo Mining District was declared an area specially reserved by the British South Africa Company against the prospecting and pegging of claims. The Secretary of State is not aware that there has been any attempt to peg or prospect within the reserved area or any collision between the officers of the Company and the general public.

South African War Claims.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is yet able to state what arrangements are being made to re-open the assessment of unpaid claims arising out of the South African War, in particular that of Dr. Chiveiback, of the Red Cross Service, already brought to his notice.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave to his Question on this subject on June 25th.†

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: If the Government are not satisfied with the treatment of this and other claims, will they re-open the assessment?

Mr. CHURCHILL asked for notice of the Question.

Ceylon Pearl Fisheries.

Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in recent years the Government of Ceylon spent some money in experiments about a machine for extracting pearls from the oysters in their fishery; if he can say when this money was spent; whether it was with a view to get rid of the expense of having a camp every year of 40,000 pearl fishers, and also to obtain higher prices; whether, some time in 1903, the Governor of Ceylon got an official Report that the experimental machinery worked successfully, and that in future the Government ought to get more than one-tenth of the profits; whether, later in the year, some arrangement was made with a Mr. Dixon for building a permanent machine, and at what cost; whether, in November, 1904, any inspection and Report was made on Mr. Dixon's machine by the Government agent, and in such case whether the official opinion was favourable to the working of the machine as regards prevention of loss of the pearls; whether any Report was made about discoloration of the pearls, and the effect upon the shells of the machine; and whether any such Reports of the Colonial officials can be laid upon the Table.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. George Dixon, who went to Ceylon as a gold specialist, made, during the fishery of the spring of 1903, with the approval of Sir West Ridgeway, experiments in the extraction of the pearls from the oysters by a process of washing. In July, 1903, Sir West Ridgeway reported that the results were so far satisfactory as to warrant their repetition on a larger and more practical scale in the fishery of the coming year. The Governor did not forward any official Report at this stage, and I am not aware whether any was made or printed. In accordance with the Governor's suggestion, Mr. Dixon constructed, designed, and worked pearl extracting machinery at the expense of the Ceylon Government between July, 1903, and March, 1905. The cost of the machinery was Rs. 76690. The object of the machinery was to improve sanitation by separating the pearls from the oysters before the oysters rotted, and, coupled with dredging, to reduce the expenses of the Government and ensure their profits. The nominal profits of the Government under the old system were two-thirds, not one-tenth. The only Reports which can be traced at the Colonial Office are one by Mr. Dixon himself, dated November 8th, 1904, and one by the Government agent of the Northern province, dated December 7th, 1904. The latter, to which the hon. Member no doubt refers, stated that the pearls were not discoloured by the process, but seems to show that in the main it was but a qualified success. Copies of these two Reports will be placed in the Library of the House. The machinery was tried further in the fishery of 1905, but no special Report on the subject seems to have reached the Secretary of State.

Miners' Petition against Coolie Repatriation.

Mr. FIENNES (Oxfordshire, Banbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any official information showing that a petition, signed by 4,000 miners, protesting against the repatriation of

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 641.

Chinese coolies, has been presented to the Earl of Selborne for transmission to His Gracious Majesty the King; and, if so, seeing that the repatriation of a large number of coolies will mean, as the petitioners point out, poverty to themselves and to their wives and families, whether he will state what action he proposes to take.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): What proportion do the miners bear to the whole body of miners?

MR. CHURCHILL: Speaking offhand, I should say about one-fifth or one-sixth. I have no official information, but I may refer to the Secretary of State's despatch, No. 124, printed at page 125 in the recent Blue-book, Cd. 3025.

***MR. LEHMANN** (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): How many of these miners, since they signed the petition, have either been murdered or subjected to outrage by Chinese coolies?

MR. FIENNES: Cannot the hon. Gentleman do something to allay the intense anxiety on the part of 20,000 British miners in Johannesburg?

MR. DEWAR: Is it not the fact that the rural population have petitioned for the repatriation of the Chinese labourers, on the ground that life has been made intolerable for them?

***MR. SPEAKER**: Order! order! Notice should be given of these Questions.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): How many of these 4,000 miners were actually miners and how many carpenters and others employed about the mines?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have no information as to that.

Uganda.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information to give to the House with regard to the reports of unrest among the natives of Uganda and the fears of a revolt against the British in that region.

MR. CHURCHILL: I presume that the hon. Member is referring to a statement which recently appeared in the newspapers to the effect that certain members of the caravan which accompanied the Duke of the Abruzzi had asserted that serious trouble was on the point of breaking out in Uganda. The Secretary of State has made inquiry on the subject and has received the following telegram from the Commissioner of Uganda in reply: "I have received no disquieting reports from the district where the Duke of the Abruzzi's party is believed to be. Inquiry is being made."

The Natal Rising.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government will consider the propriety of making a friendly representation to the Natal military authorities in favour of substituting photography for decapitation as a means of identification in the field.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir. The advantages of photography in such cases are so obvious that it may fairly be assumed that the circumstances in this instance were such as to prevent its being used.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he will consider the advisability of recommending to the Government of Natal the disuse of expansive bullets, which have been abandoned in civilised warfare, but are now being employed by native troops under the command of officers holding the King's Commission, against His Majesty's black subjects in Natal.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think it undesirable at this juncture to make any public statement as to the form or substance of any friendly representations which may from time to time be offered by His Majesty's Government to the responsible Government of Natal in regard to military operations which the latter Government is conducting with its own money and its own men, and in regard to which the Imperial Government has neither direct responsibility nor direct control.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): Has not the Government a direct responsibility for all subjects of the Crown of whatever race or colour?

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Who made these bullets?

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Will the hon. Gentleman direct the recall of British regiments from Natal?

[No Answer was given.]

Treaty of Vereniging—Definition of "Native."

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government, in the interpretation of the treaty of Vereniging, repudiate the definition of the word "Native" laid down in the Report of the South African Native Affairs Commission; and, if so, what precise meaning they attach to the word.

MR. CHURCHILL: His Majesty's Government have been advised that the adoption of the definition of the word "native" by the South African Native Affairs Commission in the interpretation of the Vereniging agreement would be regarded as a breach of the spirit of the agreement by the other parties to it.

*MR. REES: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the application of this term to British Indians causes natural and justifiable indignation?

MR. CHURCHILL: I can quite understand that.

MR. HAROLD COX: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the latter part of my Question.

MR. CHURCHILL: I believe the precise meaning attached to the word "native" is native of any country other than a European country. I cannot, on the spur of the moment, give a reply to a legal and constitutional question.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Does that apply to the Japanese?

MR. CHURCHILL: Certainly.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Lord Milner stated that the word applied solely to the aboriginal natives of South Africa?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that.

Transvaal Franchise.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government propose to exclude from the franchise in the Transvaal all coloured persons as well as natives; and, if so, whether this exclusion will apply to Boers of mixed descent or only to coloured persons of British origin.

MR. CHURCHILL: It will be necessary to confine the franchise to white men. The interpretation of this term will rest as hitherto with the Transvaal Courts.

Repatriation Notice.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the new Proclamation, authorising the repatriation of the Chinese coolies on the Rand, has yet been posted up at the mines; and, if not, will he state on what date it will be posted; and will he also give the House the exact terms of the Proclamation.

MR. CHURCHILL: The new notice was posted in the compounds on July 18th. The terms are given at page 190 of Cd. 3025.

Malta.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is able to place upon the Table of the House any further correspondence between the Government and the Governor of Malta with reference to the Reverend John McNeill.

MR. CHURCHILL: When the correspondence with the Governor of Malta on this subject is complete, the Secretary of State will consider what Papers can be laid before Parliament.

MR. CORBETT: Will that be before the Colonial Vote is taken or is it intended to keep the House in the dark?

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot say when the correspondence will be completed. We have every desire to give the hon. Gentleman all the information we can.

MR. CORBETT: Will that be before the Colonial Vote? If not, it will be of no use.

[No Answer was returned.]

Coolie Deserters.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the number of Chinese coolies who deserted from the Transvaal gold mines or were absent from work during the months of May and June respectively.

MR. CHURCHILL: The number of coolies convicted of absence without permit, desertion, and unlawful absence in May were ten, 890, 267 respectively. The numbers for June have not yet been received.

Coolie Crime in the Transvaal.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the number of white, coloured, and yellow persons, respectively, who have been murdered by Chinese coolies in the Transvaal during the first six months of this year.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is not in possession of the informaon desired by the hon. Member and has telegraphed for it.

Mortality among British Central African Natives.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received the mortality Returns of British Central Africa Natives on the mines of the Transvaal, for the year ended June 30th last; and, if so, how do they compare with previous Returns; and whether the recruiting in British Central Africa of labour for the mines is to be allowed to be recommenced.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has not yet received the mortality Returns in question, but expects them very shortly.

Bewaarplatzen.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Bewaarplatzen, which the Transvaal Government owned, have been sold, or whether they still remain the property of the State.

MR. CHURCHILL: No action as far as I am aware has been taken recently with regard to the Bewaarplatzen.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Will the hon. Gentleman make further inquiries?

MR. CHURCHILL: Certainly. I will ask my right hon. friend the Secretary of State to have the inquiry made by cable.

Bishop of Zululand's Charges.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the allegations of the Bishop of Zululand that Colonel Royston's column, early this month, took stock belonging to loyal natives, entered kraals and robbed natives of clothes and money; whether he is aware that Colonel Royston, in a sworn deposition, admits that his column looted the stock of natives whom they believed to be disloyal, and only respected the magistrate's certificate of loyalty, which few natives possess; and whether the Imperial Government will issue instructions to the Natal Government to afford protection to the lives and property of non-combatant natives and their families.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have seen telegrams in the newspapers on this subject, but the Secretary of State has not yet received official information. His Majesty's Government are not in a position to issue instructions to the Natal Government as suggested.

Mr. FLYNN: But these transactions involve a stigma on the name of this country.

Rights of Natives in the Tranvaal.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether during the negotiations that preceded the Treaty of Vereeniging, the then Colonial Secretary the Member for West Birmingham stated that His Majesty's Government, in a communication to General Botha, could not consent to purchase peace by leaving the coloured population in the position in which they stood before the war, with not even the ordinary civil rights which the Government of Cape Colony had long conceded them; whether Lord Milner has stated in writing that he always held that the word native, in the terms of surrender, meant natives and not coloured people; and whether there is any record in the Colonial Office, of the grounds on which the late Colonial Secretary the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, came to the conclusion that the word native was intended by the negotiators of the treaty to include coloured people.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In answer to the first part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the latter part of the despatch printed as No. 6 in Cd. 528, from which it would appear that the Member for West Birmingham was not alluding to native franchise. No such statement as that referred to in the second part of the Question is on record in the Colonial Office. At the time of the settlement of the Lyttelton Constitution, Lord Milner appears to have been of opinion that it was impossible not to regard Cape coloured people as covered by the word "natives" in the terms of surrender, and the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, appears to have been given to understand that the Boers would regard the word as covering all coloured persons.

Repatriation of Coolies.

Mr. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether up to June 30th only eighteen Chinese coolies convicted of crime in the Transvaal have been repatriated; and whether the powers under the ordinances for the repatriation of these criminals will be more rigorously applied.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The hon. Member has not, I think, noticed that the figure of eighteen coolies repatriated after imprisonment without option of a fine on page 168 of Cd. 3205 is for the period up to June 30th, 1905. Since then, under the Ordinance No. 27 of 1905 passed in September last, dangerous labourers are liable to be repatriated even though not convicted, and Lord Selborne reported on May 28th, as shown at page 96 of Cd. 3025, that about 500 of such undesirables have been repatriated. The Secretary of State understands that this policy is being rigorously applied.

Sir West Ridgeway's Inquiry.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what has been the cost of Sir West Ridgeway's Committee of Inquiry in South Africa; and when the Report of this Committee will be laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No final accounts have been submitted, but I understand that the cost may be expected to be £3,000 approximately. The latter part of the Question should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Looting Native Kraals.

Mr. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that soldiers in Colonel Royston's column have been accused of robbing loyal natives and burning their kraals, that they have been proved by a military court of inquiry to have looted the kraals of natives not known to be disloyal, in view also of the fact that native levies have committed excesses while nominally under the control of British and Colonial officers, he will request the Government of Natal to appoint an independent Colonial Commission of Inquiry to investigate into the conduct of these soldiers and native levies.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have no official information on this subject as yet, but it appears from the newspaper telegrams that a Court of Inquiry has already been held.

Pasova Boundary Dispute.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Stepney Division of the Tower Hamlets, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the disputed tract at Pasova is near Wazna, in Tahizan, about latitude 37 degrees; and whether the importance of the matter in connection with the Baghdad Railway project is receiving due attention from His Majesty's Government.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury, for Sir EDWARD GREY): My right hon. friend is aware of the position of the tract in dispute. As he informed the hon. Member on the 19th instant,† His Majesty's Government are giving the question their serious attention.

Seamen's Remittances.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercrombie): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can see his way to remit that part of the charge of three pence in the pound, levied on the remittance home of British seamen's wages from Hamburg and other foreign ports, which is now retained by the British Consuls in those ports.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The matter is now under the consideration of His Majesty's Government.

Turkish Customs Duties.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the recent rejection by the Porte of the proposals of the Powers in connection with the increase of the Turkish Customs duties, His Majesty's Government are now prepared to consider themselves bound by propoals which were formerly rejected, and which His Majesty's Government are in consequence justified in altering.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The reply of the Turkish Government not having satisfied the conditions asked for, the whole question is being reconsidered. No more definite statement can be made at present.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the increase of the Turkish Customs dues, if accepted by the Powers, and especially if the duties are in future to be collected by a European administration, will enable the concessionnaires of the Baghdad Railway to obtain security sufficient to raise the funds necessary for the construction of that railway; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government, before giving their final consent to such increase of the Customs, will take steps to obtain a due share of control over the line.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend does not think a forecast of this nature in regard to Turkish finance can rightly be made. The latter part of the Question concerns a matter of policy, and it would not be in the public interest to make a statement on the subject. But he wishes to remind the hon. Member that the concession for the construction of the railway is the property of a German company.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Porte has now signified their acceptance of the proposals of the powers in connection with the increase in the Turkish Customs, which they had previously rejected.

MR. RUNCIMAN: A further Note has just been addressed by the Porte to the Ambassadors at Constantinople. But we do not consider that it satisfies the conditions laid down by the Powers.

---

† See Col. 391.

MR. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government, before finally consenting to the proposed increase in the Customs duties in Turkey, will stipulate that the Budget of Macedonia shall be relieved of a large part of the military expenditure with which it is at present charged.

MR. RUNCIMAN: It is not possible to make a statement on this point, which is connected with negotiations now under consideration, and in which other Powers are concerned.

Income-Tax.

MR. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the sum of £2,968,000 of income-tax revenue shown to have been received in the period from April 1st to April 28th last was actually collected in that period by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, or was a portion of it collected by them previous to March 31st and handed over to the Treasury after that date.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): A portion was collected prior to March 31st. Money collected on account of income-tax, especially that collected in the provinces, occupies a certain time in the several stages of remittance through which it must pass before it reaches the account of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue at the Bank of England, and for this reason much of the collection during the last fortnight of the financial year is not paid into the Exchequer until after March 31st, and therefore does not figure in the Exchequer receipt until the following financial year. There was nothing abnormal in the position at the end of the last financial year.

MR. ROSE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer with which bank or banks do the Inland Revenue Commissioners keep their balances before paying them over to the Treasury at the Bank of England; and whether he can state with which bank the Inland Revenue Commissioners keep their income-tax account.

MR. ASQUITH: The account of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue is kept only at the Bank of England. There is no separate bank account for the income-tax.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether income-tax is deducted from monetary prizes offered for competition in the public services; whether any notice of such deduction is given previously to the competition; and what is the addition to the revenue by this deduction.

MR. ASQUITH: A monetary prize in the form of a single non-recurrent payment would not be held liable to income-tax. One in the form of an annuity for a period of years (such as a scholarship) would be. The Board of Inland Revenue are unable to cite any concrete instance of either contingency occurring in the public service.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: If I furnish the right hon. Gentleman with particulars of such cases will he inquire into them?

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir.

Indian Penal Code.

SIR J. JARDINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, with a view to reduce the number of executions and lighten the responsibilities of juries, Judges, and the King's advisers, he will make some inquiry into the working of the provisions of the Indian penal code, which for nearly half a century have allowed Judges in India to pass sentence of confinement for life instead of sentence of death on conviction for treason or murder, where in the opinion of the Judge extenuating circumstances disclose reasons for leniency.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): No doubt, in any amendment of the criminal law, the experience of the working of the Indian penal code ought to be considered, though the circumstances of the two countries differ widely; but any attempt to amend the law relating to murder presents very great difficulties, and I am not, as as present advised, prepared to undertake the task.

Motor Power Noxious Odours.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Sir James Dewar, professor of chemistry, has expressed the opinion that the process of combustion of petroleum requisite as a motive power for motor cars and motor omnibuses produces a gas which is extremely injurious to public health; and, in view of the inconvenience to which the public are subjected through noxious odours from this class of traffic, will he state whether the evidence of experts on this point as affecting the public health has been or will be taken.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am consulting experts on this subject.

Motor Car Speeds—Cabinet Ministers' Privilege.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the caseof a Cabinet Minister convicted of driving at a furious speed at Kingston; whether he is aware that a claim was made before the magistrate for exemption from penalty for breach of the regulations as to motor traffic by the production of a pass authorising a Cabinet Minister to take precedence for his carriage over other traffic in the streets of London; and whether, in view of the fact that the use made of this pass appears to have been abused, he will consider the advisability of withdrawing it.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I have no information on this subject other than that which has appeared in the newspapers.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiries?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I do not see what question arises with which I am concerned.

SIR F. BANBURY: It is a question of claiming the privilege.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): How many of these passes are issued?

*MR. GLADSTONE said he must ask for notice of that Question.

Leckhampton Hill Riots.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he has had any petition or petitions in favour of the partial or total remission of the unexpired sentence passed on Barrett and others at the Gloucester Assizes for rioting and causing damage on Leckhampton Hill, Gloucestershire, on Good Friday last; whether he is aware that the total amount of damage done was assessed under the county authority at less than £18; that Barrett was not present at the time of the riot; that evidence was given proving Barrett's recorded good character; that he dissuaded the persons present on the hill from unlawful acts; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I have received petitions in the case to which the hon. Member refers, and they are now under consideration. As the question is one of the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, I am precluded from making any statement as to the inquiries I may make or the advice I may ultimately have to give.

Motor Licences.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state in how many instances during the current year persons holding motor licences have had such licences suspended or cancelled for being responsible for accidents in the Metropolitan Police area.

*MR. GLADSTONE: So far as I am able to ascertain no licences have been suspended during the current year on account of accidents in the Metropolitan Police area. It should be remembered that the police have no power to suspend or cancel motor licences.

Police and the Yiddish Language.

SIR W. EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the amount of the reward granted to the police for qualifying in the Yiddish language; and how many members of the force have earned and received it.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Two prizes of £5 each and two of £2 10s. each have been offered to officers who may attain a high degree of proficiency in the Yiddish language. These prizes have not yet been won, but last year eight small prizes of a total value of £4 5s. were given to the more successful students, and this year fourteen officers will receive some small recognition, as the result of a recent examination, at a total cost of £6 12s. 6d.

Laundries.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the situation of the English orphanage laundry mentioned as the best on pages 257 and 258 of the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories, 1906, in which girls of twelve and thirteen are employed for eleven and a-quarter hours a day; also the name and address of the society conducting it; and also, on what general grounds the chief lady factory inspector considered this particular laundry to be the best.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give the names of the societies and of the manageresses of the five Catholic and two Protestant institutions at which Miss Deane and Miss Martindale were refused admittance as mentioned on page 258 of the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories, 1906, and where these houses are situated; and whether in default of legislation compelling inspection, he will consider the desirability in the interests of the public of giving in future reports the names of such institutions as refuse inspection.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to answer these two Questions together. It is not the practice of the Department to divulge the names of the places referred to, by way of illustration or otherwise, in the factory inspectors' reports. To do so would be both impolitic and unfair, and would tend to hinder rather than help the work of the Department. This consideration applies with especial force in the case of institutions which are not under the Factory Act at all. The English orphanage laundry referred to was, I understand, considered the best by the principal lady inspector on account of its cleanliness and good administration.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the Reports of the lady factory inspectors on the conditions of women and child labour in Catholic, Protestant, and other semi-charitable laundries and workshops; and whether he will consider the advisability of extending at an early date to these unpaid and unprotected workers the State protection of the Factories Acts.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I hope to introduce legislation on this subject next session, if possible.

Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the recent case under the Workmen's Compensation Act, in which the Deputy Judge of the Southwark County Court reduced an allowance to an injured workman from 15s. per week to 1d., his attention has been called to the shorthand notes of the judgment, from which it appears that one of the reasons given by the Deputy Judge for reducing the allowance was to induce the injured man to undergo a surgical operation to which he objected; whether the man was informed that in the event of such operation proving unsuccessful he could apply for the restoration of his allowance; and, further, whether, in view of the fact that there is no compulsion by law upon any injured workman to undergo a surgical operation against his will, it is proposed to take any steps to restore this workman to his previous position.

***MR. GLADSTONE**: I am informed by the Deputy Judge that he reduced the allowance because he was satisfied that the workman was at the time quite well and able to work. In any case I have no authority to interfere with the decision of a Court of law. The only appeal from the decision of a County Court in a case under the Workmen's Compensation Act is the appeal given by the Act to the Court of Appeal.

MR. BOTTOMLEY asked the right hon. Gentleman to read the shorthand notes of the judgment.

Crumlin Level Crossing.

COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the danger and inconvenience occasioned to the public by the retention of a level crossing over the Great Western Railway at Crumlin, Monmouthshire; and whether he will take steps to compel the company to substitute some other means of crossing.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Complaint has been made to the Board of Trade of delay to road traffic at the level crossing in question, and the Board communicated with the Great Western Railway Company thereon. I am now informed by the company that they are investigating the matter; also that the provision of a road bridge in lieu of the crossing has been under consideration for some time past, and that negotiations with the Monmouthshire County Council are in progress. The Board of Trade appear to have no powers which would enable them to require the company to substitute a bridge or subway for the crossing.

Motor-Bus Speed.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the large motor omnibuses in use in London are classed under Article VII. of the regulations made by the Local Government Board among the vehicles which may be driven at eight miles an hour or twelve miles an hour; and, if the latter, whether these motor omnibuses are deemed to have their wheels fitted with pneumatic tyres or tyres made of soft or elastic material.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I understand that the registered axle weights of the motor omnibuses in London do not exceed six tons and that the tyres are of solid rubber, which is regarded as a soft or elastic material. Consequently the maximum speed at which they may be driven is twelve miles an hour.

Training Colleges.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the case of pupil teachers who win high places in the King's scholarship list at the end of their apprenticeships, and find themselves debarred from obtaining entrance with their scholarships into many of the State-aided residential training colleges because of their religious beliefs; whether he is aware of the fact that this circumstance exposes these young people to the temptation to change their religion in order to enjoy the scholarships they have duly earned; and whether, in pursuance of the policy of abolishing religious tests for teachers, he will consider the desirableness of introducing a provision into the regulations governing the dispensation of Government grants to residential training colleges to the effect that no King's scholar otherwise duly qualified by character and attainments shall be refused admission on the grounds of his or her religious belief.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): In answer to the first paragraph of the Question, I am given to understand that the residential training colleges which are undenominational are always full and are so few in number that cases of the kind referred to necessarily arise, though I hope that the result suggested in the second paragraph does not often follow. A considerable increase in the number of local authorities' training colleges will, I hope, occur in the near future, stimulated by the large building grants now afforded by the Board of Education; and as these new colleges will be undenominational, the difficulty referred to by the hon. Member will gradually be met in the only really effective way. For I do not think that the method suggested in the third paragraph of the Question would meet the difficulty at all satisfactorily. If a young person between eighteen and twenty is to become a residential student within an institution conducted admittedly for denominational purposes and permeated intentionally with a denominational atmosphere, he or she should be in sympathy with the denomination in question; for, if not, one of the main objects of the institution will be completely thwarted and the scholar be subjected to influences not desired for him by his parents. The situation is a difficult one, and before undertaking to alter next year's regulations I prefer to wait and see whether we may not attain better results by having secured the establishment of an increasing number of undenominational colleges—an object to which the Board are giving their best attention and offering large pecuniary inducements.

DR. MACNAMARA: What is it proposed to do in the case of young persons who prefer a residential to a day college?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not suppose young persons would desire to go into denominational colleges out of sympathy with their own denomination. The whole question, however, is being considered.

Pupil Teachers' Grants.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, whether under Article 27 of the new Regulations for the instruction and training of pupil teachers, the grant will be payable to the managers of pupil teacher centres, other than county council pupil teacher centres, in respect of each pupil teacher in attendance, such grant to be then handed over to the pupil teacher.

MR. BIRRELL: The Answer is in the negative. The grants under Article 27 of the Regulations are not payable to the managers of pupil teacher centres or to local education authorities in respect of the centres provided by them. They are payable to county councils, as local education authorities for elementary education, in respect of pupil teachers employed in public elementary schools maintained by them, and as contributions towards the expenses which county councils incur in respect of the travelling and other incidental expenses of pupil teachers who are instructed at centres. There is no requirement that the county council shall make a corresponding grant of £2 or of any other amount to every such pupil teacher.

Welsh Minister of Education.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, if the new Minister for Welsh Education will receive a salary in respect of educational work.

MR. BIRRELL: I must ask the hon. Member's attention to the Government Amendments to Clause 25 which dispose of his Question.

School Fees.

MR. FULLERTON (Cumberland, Egremont): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what number of elementary schools in England and Wales continue to charge school fees; whether he is aware that these fees are imposed in many districts where the population is poor, whereas in other districts in the same town no fees are charged, although the population is more prosperous; and whether he will make provision in the Education Bill now before Parliament for the deduction of the amount of the school fees from the additional grant proposed to be given under the Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: There are 810 public elementary schools in England and Wales (of which twenty are higher elementary schools) charging fees in one or more of their departments. I must refer the hon. Member to the reply that I gave on this subject on July 12th to the hon. Member for Blackburn.† It is not possible in the present Bill to do as suggested in the Question.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 1063.

Clause 2 of the Education Bill.

LORD ROBERT CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he intends to propose any Amendment to Clause 2, limiting the power of the owners of the schoolhouse to use the schoolhouse for any purposes they think fit, under sub-section (2) of that clause, or any Amendment to Clause 4, sub-section (4), giving the parent as well as the owner a right of appeal under that sub-section.

MR. BIRRELL: As to the first point, I have not yet been able to find words which would limit the power of user by the owners of the schoolhouse without inflicting an injury upon them which appears unnecessary. As to the parent's appeal, the Answer is in the negative.

The Council for Wales.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether under sub-section (8) of Section 37 of the Education Bill there would be any, and, if so, what means of preventing an Order in Council, proposed to be made under that section, from coming into force.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): I assume that for the purposes of this Question the noble Lord contemplates that the Administration will refuse to give effect to a condemnation by this House of the Order in Council. If they should give effect to such a Resolution of course no difficulty will arise. If they should refuse, the ordinary methods of constitutional practice are open for the adoption of Parliament. The resignation of the Minister responsible could be enforced by refusal to vote his salary, and the resignation of the whole Ministry could be enforced by the refusal to vote Supply. If these methods are not drastic enough, there still remains the rusty but formidable weapon of impeachment. But I think the question is somewhat academic because the President of the Board of Trade has put down Amendments adapted to meet the point of the Question.

Rathkeale Post Office.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can say whether Mrs. Howard, the new postmistress at Rathkeale, has taken the premises for the post office there from which the representatives of James Carey, deceased, were lately evicted for one year's rent; whether he is aware that James Carey effected improvements in the premises to the value of £500, and, owing to the rent charged by the landlord, the tenant's representatives could not dispose of their interest at a fair price, and that the town tenants association in Rathkeale called upon the landlord to fix such a fair rent for the premises as would enable them to do so; and whether, in the interest of the public peace, as well as in that of keeping the Post Office outside matters of Party dispute, he will take steps to see that Mrs. Howard, a public official, has nothing to do with the premises.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I have no knowledge of the circumstances referred to by the hon. Member, but am making inquiry. In any case, however, the matter is not one in which, as Postmaster-General, I can directly interfere.

The Ridgeway Commission's Report.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when he proposes to lay the Report of the Ridgeway Commission upon the Table.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The Report is necessarily of a confidential nature for the information of the Government, and I should doubt if it is of the character of documents which are ordinarily laid on the Table. I will consider the matter, but I am not prepared at this stage to say whether it will be laid or not.

MR. LYTTELTON: May I ask the Prime Minister whether the expenses of this Commission are not public expenses; whether the Commission was not appointed, in substance, to furnish information in which the Government said they were deplorably lacking; and whether he considers it fair, as the Commission sat with closed doors in South Africa, to withdraw from us the information before this debate takes place?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know what information we are withdrawing from the right hon. Gentleman. He acted in the matter without any information at all. He was quite ready to give a Constitution without any inquiry, and in that we differ from him.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I must correct the Prime Minister. The correspondence in reference to the Constitution we brought forward lasted, I think, eight months; and it was considered at public meetings in the Colonies during all that time. The deplorable lack of information to which the right hon. Gentleman referred was his own lack of information and not mine.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No doubt, the right hon. Gentleman had the information which he desired. But, as a matter of fact, this Report has only been just received. I have seen it myself; but a good many of my colleagues have not yet seen it. We must consider what its nature is. It will require a certain amount of preparation—not on our part, but on the part of the Commission, if it should be made public. On these grounds, I do not think I can promise it will be published—if at all—before the discussion.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am sorry to be so pertinacious. But I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is right or fair that this House should enter on a debate, which is finally to settle the Constitution of the Transvaal, without that information which the Government appointed a Commission to obtain?

[No Answer was returned.]

Committee of Defence.

Major SEELY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, whether the Committee of Defence is now representative of all sections of political opinion in the State; and, if not, whether he will consider the desirability of so altering its constitution that in future it shall do so, with a view to the ultimate inclusion of representatives from all parts of the Empire.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think the Committee of Defence is of the nature which my hon. friend seems to impute to it. It is a part of the administrative machinery of the Government of the day, and it hardly admits of extension to so wide a field as he indicates.

Scottish Bills.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange to have the Crofters Acts Amendment Bill introduced before the House adjourns, so that those interested may have an opportunity of considering and discussing the measure with their constituents before the House reassembles in October.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I propose to ask the House to have a special sitting on Saturday for the purpose of introducing this and another Scottish Bill.

Irish Tobacco Bill.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister, if he will give facilities for the passing of the Irish Tobacco Bill, which is unopposed.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid we cannot find time for this additional Bill.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: In view of the fact that this Bill is entirely unopposed will the right hon. Gentleman give it favourable consideration in the autumn?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am rather doubtful as to the fact whether it is unopposed.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: If the right hon. Gentleman knows anyone opposing it will he let me know who it is ?

[No Answer was returned.]

Denshawi Trial—Papers.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will provide that, after the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs lays upon the Table the promised official Papers in regard to the Denshawi trials and executions, some time shall be given to the House to discuss the subject.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The only time I can suggest for raising the question will be on the Report stage of the Foreign Office Vote, after the Home Office Vote has been taken on the last allotted day, that is to say, on August 1st.

Traffic Commission's Report.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can now give any indication of the steps that the Government may take to give effect to the recommendations of the Traffic Commission, in view of the investigations of that Commission into the traffic problems of the Metropolis which have now reached so acute a stage.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid that the Government will require more time for considering the recommendations of the Traffic Commission, and they have also to bear in mind that the Reports of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars and the Select Committee on Cabs may have some bearing on the question—all the more because of the absolutely transitional stage which this problem has now reached.

Scottish Supply.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in allotting the time for the consideration of Supply, he will allow one day for the consideration of the Scottish Estimates, for which there has not yet been any real opportunity during this session.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not see how it is possible to find a day for the purpose.

Trawling Legislation.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he has yet had an opportunity of making himself acquainted with the Trawlers' Certificate Suspension Bill; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the line fishing industry around the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland suffers from the depredations of trawlers, he is prepared to give facilities for the Bill this session.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I doubt if I can promise facilities for any more Bills; but I certainly cannot do anything to specially facilitate this Bill which is far from being unopposed.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that representatives of sea-board constituencies are strongly in favour of this Bill ?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he could add nothing to his Answer.

MR. WEIR: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the name of a single Member opposing this Bill ?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If I knew I should be chary about giving names.

Irish Representation on Royal Commissions.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will state why Unionist Members of Parliament, representing Irish constituencies, have been excluded from membership of three recently appointed Royal Commissions, namely, the Trinity College Commission, Irish Railways Commission, and Congested Districts Commission; whether he will take steps to secure that the Irish Unionist Party be given representation on these Royal Commissions; and, further, will he state the special qualifications of the hon. Member for Inverness Burghs to serve on the Congested Districts Commission.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There has been no exclusion, but a desire to secure the men most specially qualified for the work in each particular case. No Member of Parliament has been placed on the Trinity College Commission except the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge who has the special qualifications of being an Irishman resident in Ireland and a distinguished scholar and former professor in a great university. No Member of Parliament at all has been placed on the Railway Commission, because it was not thought necessary. A gentleman who was till last year a Conservative Member of Parliament and who has long resided in Ireland has been placed on the Congested Districts Commission. I am not aware that there is any Conservative Irish Member who has resided in a congested district. The special qualifications of the hon. Member for the Inverness Burghs are that he has for some years past spent a large part of every year in Ireland and studied the land problem there, and that he is also acquainted with the similar problem which presents itself in the North of Scotland.

Musical Copyright Bill.

Mr. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that the Musical Copyright Bill was introduced as a private Member's Bill, and in view of the character of its provisions, he will leave the decision on the Third Reading an open question and not put on the Government tellers.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Bill has been thoroughly discussed since its adoption by the Government, and I see no reason for taking the course suggested.

MR. J. D. WHITE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the wages of any police constables in the Metropolitan area have been or are being paid by persons interested in musical copyrights or taking proceedings under the Musical Copyright Act, 1902; and, if so, what number are presently employed in that way; and whether, when so employed, they exercise their powers in plain clothes.

***MR. GLADSTONE**: A few constables were employed in 1903 at the cost of the agents of the Musical Copyright Association. Since that year only one constable has been employed for two days in 1905; he was in plain clothes. None are at present employed.

Irish Supply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked the Prime Minister whether he could not give a more favourable answer than on a previous occasion in respect of the Irish Supply, put down for Thursday next. He reminded the right hon. Gentleman of the invariable practice since the Supply rule was established of acknowledging some priority of claim on the part of the Opposition, who were the natural critics of the Government; and, therefore, some part of the three days to be devoted to Irish Supply should be given to those representatives of Ireland who were not supporters of the Government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: said that it was unnecessary to argue the question with the right hon. Gentleman. He admitted that there was a good deal in what the right hon. Gentleman said. He was not without hope that if the right hon. Gentleman repeated his question to-morrow he would then be able to give a definite answer.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Cumberland (Cockermouth Division), in the room of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, baronet, deceased.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, ETC.

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., have leave to sit to-morrow during the sitting of the House for the consideration of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—(*Mr. Eugene Wason.*)

OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS, ETC.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.]

NEW BILLS.

LAND TENURE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To deal with Land Tenure in Scotland," presented by Mr. Munro Ferguson; supported by Mr. Lamont; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 321.]

ACCESS TO MOUNTAINS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To secure to the public the right of Access to Mountains and Moorlands in Scotland," presented by Mr. Annan Bryce; supported by Mr. Crombie, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Alexander Black, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Mr. Gulland, Mr. J. M. Henderson, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Dundas White, and Mr. Wilkie; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 322.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) moved to recommit the Bill in respect of Clauses 4 and 25, because he desired to impress upon the House the importance of giving adequate discussion to these two clauses. He did not think any hon. Member would say that these clauses had received discussion which could be described in any way as adequate. The clauses effected changes in our educational system which might well form the subject of special Bills. Clause 25 proposed a change of far-reaching character which in point of fact had hardly been touched upon. They must look at things as they were, and anyone looking at the Notice Paper would see there was no possibility of discussing the clause upon the Report stage. When it was down in Committee the discussion was confined to one day. He would like to draw the attention of the House to the actual proposals made by the clause as originally drafted. It proposed substantial autonomy for Wales. It proposed also a council for Wales with large powers but without any control by the House or by any Minister sitting in the House. To that proposal a great deal of objection had been taken and Amendments were put down by the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool which would have practically reduced the council to a subordinate position. The President of the Board of Trade then rose and said he proposed to accept these Amendments—in fact the right hon. Gentleman propounded a scheme of a contradictory character. He proposed the creation of a Welsh Minister who was to have no salary and no department, but upon whom complicated and responsible duties would devolve. He would have the control, not only of the whole of Welsh education, but also the Council for Wales itself. No power, however, had been actually granted to him to do so; that was regarded as a detail by the Government. Meanwhile the Board of Education was to be kept in force in Wales. Now they were faced with a still further problem, because the Government, having considered the proposal, recognised the impossibility of asking the House to assent to it without further consideration. The Welsh Minister had already had his existence suspended, and the Treasury was to have control of public expenditure in Wales. He ventured to say it was quite impossible to ask the House to pass these proposals without any further consideration or any possibility of modifying them. The only other course open to the Government than that proposed by his Motion was to withdraw Clause 25 altogether. As to Clause 4, he ventured to say the case was just as strong. The House would remember the history of the clause. As originally drafted it was one of considerable length, but by reason of the Government Amendments introduced in Committee it eventually occupied two and a half pages. He had observed that no less than twenty-five Amendments were put down by the Minister for Education, and some of these were of a character which it was impossible for the House to deal with, even theoretically. He wished most earnestly to impress upon the attention of the House the actual general provisions of the clause; if those provisions were agreed to without adequate discussion the House would not be maintaining its dignity as a legislative body. Clause 4 conceded the principle that denominational religion ought to be taught in denominational schools; it conceded the parental principle, viz., that parents should have the right to determine the religious education of the children; and also that teachers should be permitted to give denominational instruction. These were three very important principles in the general scheme of the Bill, and if they were to be granted they should be granted effectively. When they came to look at how the clause itself would be affected, the change proposed to be introduced by the Government made it far worse than it originally. Let them take the question of the ballot: he had no doubt whatever that the introduction of the ballot had raised the proportion that was required to bring a school under the clause from four-fifths to nine-tenths. Moreover, it was quite clear that if only a single child attended the school who did not desire the facilities under Clause 4, and if there did not happen to be another school convenient for that child in the neighbourhood, the whole of the rest of the children would be forced to accept the teaching of undenominational religion. That provision alone could be satisfactory if the object which the Government professed to have in view was to be carried out. He drew attention to the second half of the clause because that was the part held out to the Opposition as a concession of great importance on the clause as originally drafted. Let the House remember that the operation of that part of the clause would only arise in the case of a hostile local education authority. What was the appeal to be? To begin with, it was not only given to the parents aggrieved, but to the owners or trustees. It had to be shown to the Education Department, in the first place, that the conditions of Clause 4 had not been complied with in the case of the school in question; and, in the second place, it had to be shown that the school was one to which the Education Department would desire to extend facilities. Then they would have to provide for a local inquiry before the school could be transferred, and in that case twenty families would have to make application to the local education authority which must satisfy the Education Department, both that there were parents of four-fifths of the children attending the school —or, as he contended, nine-tenths— demanding the facilities, and also that there was no public accommodation for the remainder of the children. If the local education authority said that these conditions had not been satisfied the appeal went. Then assuming that they got to the position that these conditions were complied with, there were the conditions applied to the owners who asked for extended facilities. Further, at the very best the facilities were only to be granted for five years. But if the facilities were granted for five years what was to prevent a hostile majority on the local education authority then dismissing the old denominational teachers and using that as a means for the transformation of the denominational school into a public elementary school? That was positively what, in his opinion, this Amendment amounted to, so that the concession was absolutely worthless. The right hon. Gentleman had repeatedly said that he regarded this clause as essential to the Bill; if so, could not the right hon. Gentleman make the clause real in order that it might meet a real religious grievance? If this clause, which was a gigantic exception to the whole framework of the Bill was to be made a real and not a sham clause; as the right hon. Gentleman said it was the intention of the Government it should be, then the Government must consent, if necessary, to deal with it seriously, even at the loss of some of the popularity which they at present possessed. What was the use of a Government coming back with great power and position unless that power and position were to be used for a great end? Was there any object on which their majority and position could be expended more worthily than in settling this great religious question, in promoting the prosperity of the country, and in preserving the spiritual and religious welfare of the people? He begged to move.

Motion made and question proposed, "That the Bill be recommitted in respect of Clauses 4 and 25."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said that the time occupied by this Motion might have been better spent in discussing the new clauses and the Amendments on the Paper. He admitted Clause 4 was open to criticism, but that was hardly a reason for recommittal. The clause had been much discussed, and the Amendments now standing on the Paper were the result of that discussion. Naturally he was somewhat attached to the clause, because it had cost him so much pain and trouble; but he thought the hon. Member for the Louth Division would be glad to know from the noble Lord that only five per cent. of the Anglican schools would get the benefit of the clause. The information of the Board of Education was of a totally different character. Clause 25 in its new form must also be regarded as the result of Committee discussion. It was easy to make fun of this embryonic Welsh Minister, this embarrassed phantom that never appeared. In consequence of the constitutional objection urged by hon. Gentlemen opposite, the embryonic Minister disappeared; and the House had only to deal with a very modified, minimized, and reduced clause. Nevertheless, the Welsh Members were satisfied with the permission to establish this Welsh Council, and if they were content to be placed under the scorpions of the Treasury instead of under the whips of the Board of Education, that was their affair. The Government had conceded everything except the creation of a Welsh Council of the kind indicated in the first part of Clause 25. If the Welsh Members thought—and he did not wonder that they should think—that that was a step forward in the right path, which secured to them a local interest in and control over their whole system of education so that they might show the same mastery over elementary as they had already shown over secondary education—if they were content for a time, at all events, to work in that way without incurring any additional expense to the Exchequer, he did not see, although it might be good fun to ridicule them for the very little they were getting, that that was any ground for the recommittal of the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the right hon. Gentleman had a very singular idea of what Parliamentary discussion was or ought to be. He had shown great ability in the conduct of the Bill, great charm of manner, dexterity, and many other Parliamentary qualities; but one thing he had not achieved was the thorough discussion and sifting of the proposals which he had brought before the House. He instanced Clause 4. In Committee they did not discuss either the question of appeal or the question of the teachers or the question of the population limit, three great points which lay at the very root of the clause. The right hon. Gentleman had got into the habit of thinking the proper way of dealing with the Bill was to put down Amendments at odd times and get them passed under the closure.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is following the precedent you set.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR observed that all the great principles of the Bill of 1902 were discussed before the closure was applied. There was nothing comparable to Clause 4 in the Bill of 1902 that was not threshed out day after day and week after week in Committee. But he had never denied, and did not deny, that closure resolutions on a great Bill might probably be necessary. What he complained of was that in this case the compartments were so contrived that most important points in the Bill never had been discussed at all, and the latter portion of Clause 4 was, of all portions of the Bill, the one which most needed examination at the hands of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had said that his Amendments to the clause were Amendments of detail. Might he remind the right hon. Gentleman that one of these Amendments would forbid any appeal to the Education Department after January 1st, 1908? It therefore excluded from any appeal all future cases of Clause 4 schools, whether they were existing schools or schools brought into being to meet the changing needs of the population. While under Clause 4 it was admitted that the arrangements made were merely interim arrangements capable of and very likely requiring revision at quinquennial periods, the appeal which was admitted to be necessary at the beginning of these quinquennial periods was not regarded as necessary at any subsequent stage. While the case in respect of Clause 4 was overwhelming, the case in respect of Clause 25 was even stronger. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to think that the object of the

Opposition was to turn the proceedings on that clause into ridicule. They were ridiculous enough, he admitted. But he had a much more serious object in view. He thought the whole procedure of the Government in respect of Clause 25 was a travesty of Parliamentary proceedings and calculated to bring the legislative powers of the House into ridicule. They put down a clause in their original Bill, a mere skeleton clause which evidently had not been thought out by its author or authors, and which contained no evidence whatever that the inevitable difficulties which any great change of the kind must carry with it had been either considered or provided against. Suddenly, on the very day on which the clause was to be considered in Committee, the Minister in charge suggested an entirely different and very absurd and objectionable scheme for constituting a Minister for Wales. Some of the Amendments were submitted in manuscript, others had not even reached the manuscript stage, and they remained in the form of promises which apparently had been unfulfilled. The plan of the Government lived its summer day; it fluttered for a moment in the sun and it died. n Saturday morning a third scheme was brought forward, differing fundamentally from both its predecessors, but sharing a great many of their defects. When were they to discuss this scheme? The opportunity would not occur on the Report stage. The only way in which the Government could give a chance for its discussion was by accepting the present Motion. If they had the smallest regard either for their own legislative credit or for the credit of the House of Commons they were, it seemed to him, driven by irresistible logic to do one of two things. Either let them assent to the Motion and give the House a chance of criticising the Bill, or let them treat their new proposals with the same contempt which they had shown for their old proposals and drop them out of the Bill at the first opportunity. There seemed to him to be conclusive reasons why these two clauses should be brought before the House in Committee, and he earnestly asked the Government whether they could not meet his noble friend in this matter.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he had a great respect for the right hon. Gentleman, but he thought it took a little Parliamentary hardihood on his part to make such a speech as that to which they had just listened. Complaint was made that sufficient time had not been given to discuss Clauses 4 and 25. Clause 4 was discussed for three days and Clause 25 had one day, and for the right hon. Gentleman to say that this was a drastic proceeding that could not be justified was to his mind a classic instance of Satan reproving sin. The right hon. Gentleman justified his action in 1902. Everyone knew what happened then. They ambled through the Committee stage of that Bill for thirty-seven days.

*MR. SPEAKER hoped the hon. Gentleman was not going to tell the House what happened in 1902. If the hon. Member started that no one could tell how long they would be.

DR. MACNAMARA said that all he intended to say was that the right hon. Gentleman justified what took place in 1902, and that nothing now taking place was at all comparable with what took place then. What then happened was that all the enactments of this country for thirty years were being swept away without a single word of comment. Sixteen enactments from 1870, down to 1900——

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member will not pursue that argument. If he continues someo ne on the other side will want to reply to him and I do not see how we are to stop if that occurs.

DR. MACNAMARA said he only wanted to point out that the two things were not comparable, and that the scheme to-day did give a fair amount of discussion to Clauses 4 and 25. He felt that the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman was not justified and if he wanted to use profitably the three days now given his advice to him was to get on as fast as possible with the things which the Government had provided for discussion during those three days.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he certainly thought what they were debating was not the Bill first introduced and it was not the Bill so suddenly and strangely transferred by the group of Amendments which they had had no opportunity of seeing until as late as last Saturday. In his opinion, the Government were not treating Parliament in the way in which Parliament ought to be treated, and he hoped the course which had been pursued would not be made a precedent. The House of Commons should have an opportunity for free discussion and debate, but the opportunity for discussion had been so greatly restricted in this case, where it was so much needed, that it was, so far as Clause 25 was concerned, absolutely non-existent. The new clauses of the right hon. Gentleman created an entire change in our representative system. Our system of government and administration had been a system of government by the majority. On this occasion, for the first time, there was introduced in our legislation, practically without notice, the principle of proportionate representation. That might be a good or a bad system, but a new departure in our system of government and administration should not be sprung upon the House in this way. He thought that that in itself was sufficient reason why this Bill should be recommitted in order that there should be a full investigation of its provisions. It ought to be borne in mind also that the proposals would have a most unfortunate effect on the public service, as some of the staff would probably be transferred from Whitehall to a country town in Wales. The Secretary of State for War had said earlier in the day that a soldier could not be transferred without his consent. A few hours later, in another service less severe in its administration, public officers were to be transferred whether they liked it or not. They were to be taken from Whitehall, where probably their whole lives had been spent, to some picturesque but remote district in Wales. The House ought also to have some regard to the teachers. A teacher at present, on entering this important profession had both Wales and England before him. If this clause passed the teacher entering the Welsh service would be cut off from the larger and wider service of this country. That was a great hardship on the teachers and one to which they ought not to be exposed. Although much was heard of Wales it was well to remember that there were many families living in Wales whose sympathies were entirely English; and it was treating them with great severity and hardship to transfer them and cut them off from the English counties with which their sympathies were so greatly and intimately associated. Many had felt that any administration which created isolation in Wales, which though it might be a nation was still a province, was not an advantage to Wales. He sincerely hoped that both men and women born in Wales who entered the teaching profession might have a career wider than that provided by Wales, and might rise to great distinction. He regretted a policy which would result in the isolation of the Principality. There were many persons of great promise in the Welsh Universities, and it would not be just to them to confine their career to Wales, picturesque and beautiful though it was.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said he rose not to follow the hon. Baronet in discussing the merits of this change but in order to bring the House back to the real facts. The Leader of the Opposition had given a highly imaginative account of how the changes of which he had complained had arisen. What were the real facts? First of all, the Government put down a Motion on the Paper which would, if carried, have set up autonomy in Welsh education and created a Welsh Council. The minority in Wales was of opinion that that would be dangerous unless it was properly safeguarded. The Government then asked what safeguards the minority required, and the hon. Member for the Walton Division and the hon. Member for Blackpool and other hon. Members set down Amendments which they considered would constitute safeguards. The Government had, in substance, accepted all those Amendments, and these were the changes of which the Leader of the Opposition complained. The hon. Baronet's main ground of complaint was that they had introduced representation of minorities into this new clause. That proposal had been introduced to satisfy the late Secretary of the Board of Education and the hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division. They had agreed as far as was practicable that minorities should be represented in the proportion of one to three in order to allay the apprehensions of their friends the Churchpeople in Wales. It was on this ground that they were now asked to reconsider the whole clause. That showed that it was not a safeguard the Opposition wanted, but simply an excuse for killing the clause.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, N., Chorley) asked why it should kill the clause to recommit it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the noble Lord knew perfectly well that it would mean further delay, and the Lords were already complaining that they were sending up the Bill late. He would point out what they had accepted, and by accepting, transformed this clause, for he admitted that they had transformed the clause. Five demands were made by the Opposition, represented by the hon. and learned Member for Walton. First of all he demanded Parliamentary representation and control. The second demand was representation of minorities. As a general principle, he admitted that would be undesirable, but Wales was an exceptional case, the majorities on the county councils being overwhelming. The third demand was that all questions dealing with religion should be reserved to the Board of Education. The fourth was that estimates should be tabled by somebody representing the Government. The fifth demand was that there should be an audit by the Auditor and Comptroller-General. That was an Amendment moved by the late Financial Secretary to the Treasury. Those five Amendments made by the Opposition, which on the whole he thought were fair and reasonable, they had accepted, and because they had done so, forsooth, they were considered to have done something grossly unparliamentary and subversive of every precedent. It showed that it was no use making concessions to the Opposition at all; they were simply made the ground for abuse which approached the offensive. It perplexed him to know what the Leader of the Opposition got so excited about. The right hon. Gentleman had discussed religion, not exactly with calm, but with a certain amount of self-restraint, but when they made concessions to the other side his oratorical calm-brake snapped.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University): Much like yours.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was then that the Leader of the Opposition could not contain himself and got absolutely beyond control. The Government had accepted those five amendments subject to two alterations. The first was that instead of having the Board of Education in command they thought on the whole it had better be the Treasury. The Treasury at present exercised control over secondary and higher education in Wales, and they thought it better that one control should be established over the three branches, so that they might be co-ordinated. The Leader of the Opposition said they had abandoned their ground. All that they had done, however, was to make it clear that there was no idea of establishing a new Ministry for Wales, and for this reason they put the matter under the control of some official representing the Treasury in this House, and answerable to it. They had also provided for the representation of the minority on the executive as well as on the council. He thought they had treated the minority with great consideration, although the only result had been that they had been violently attacked. However, they proposed to stand to their proposals.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said he was not going into the history of the 1902 Act, in view of Mr. Speaker's ruling, except to point out that an intelligent and competent Opposition did not find any reason to propose the recommittal of any of the clauses of that Bill, the only point upon which recommittal was sought having been a small financial one which came from the then Government's own side. He would venture to say that neither in that nor in any other Bill that ever came before the House were two clauses so contentious so little discussed, clauses in which the difficulty created by the Government pressed so heavily on the Opposition, and which on the Report stage they were likely to have so little opportunity of discussing. They knew that this clause stood until Wednesday afternoon last an unworkable clause. The President of the Board of Trade then produced a perfectly new clause which he described as a concession. He did not think there was any suggestion in the Opposition Amendments that there should be a Minister for Welsh education. As regarded the points which were said to be conceded, he granted that the right hon. Gentleman had fully carried out his undertaking as to minority representation, but not as to Parliamentary control. How could they ascertain the money that was due to the Welsh schools? Hitherto that was done for this country and for Wales under the Code. The annual grant due to the schools was determined under the conditions laid down in the Act of 1870 by the minutes or the Code of the Board of Education for which the Minister for Education was responsible to this House. Who was to be responsible for the conditions under which the Welsh schools were to receive the grant? Who was to determine the amount of money required? Who was to answer for the amount required, for conditions under which it was demanded, or for the expenditure of the money? Was the unfortunate Secretary of the Treasury to develop all of a sudden among his multifarious duties into a Welsh Minister for Education? Had the holder of that office to defend in this House the terms of a Code which he had probably never seen? Who was to draw up the Code? Where was the permanent staff? Certainly the Welsh Council would have no power out of moneys received from Parliament to pay for a staff, because every penny received under the Parliamentary Grant it must pay under various Acts of Parliament to local education authorities. Therefore it must rely upon charitable contributions to create a staff. So much for Parliamentary representation. He really did not think that the reasonable demands of the Opposition formulated last Wednesday had been in any way met by the creation of this butterfly Minister for a few hours. Such as he was he had now disappeared and given place to the Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury, who, Heaven knew, had enough to do without having Welsh education thrown upon his already overburdened shoulders. Then what was to be the outcome of this most anomalous creation they now had before them? The Board of Education was given an independent authority in some matters of Welsh education and an appellate jurisdiction in others. Supposing that the Board of Education fell out with the Council, who was to compose the differences, to explain them or be responsible to Parliament for the action of either authority? Really, a couple of days close argument was not at all too much to make this a workable clause. Clause 4 was also a most contentious and important one and it had not received anything like adequate discussion. The Minister for Education appeared to have very little idea of the importance of the provisions of this clause. They had not yet discussed the population limit, the right to employ the teacher, the character of the State-aided school, to say nothing of the creation of a Minister for Welsh Education long after the Bill had been before the House. All these matters needed very careful discussion, and they had been cut off at every turn in discussing them. The Government had sprung upon them new Amendments and clauses without giving adequate time for their discussion. Therefore he thought his noble friend was justified in asking that the Bill should be recommitted.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said that Clause 4 in its original form was not discussed in the House and the Amendments put down to it by the Government were not disclosed in Committee. The Government Amendments were put down on the Report stage; a large number of Amendments had been put down to those proposals, and they would not be discussed at all. The Bill from the start had never been properly discussed, and a Motion for its recommittal was the only way they had got of protesting against such a method of proceeding. As Clause 25 was originally printed in the Bill, no one doubted that its financial arrangements were impossible, unsatisfactory, and unworkable. What was done? The President of the Board of Trade invented a new Welsh Minister for Education, but this afternoon he had slurred over that part of the story and made no reference to the Welsh Minister for Education whom he previously introduced. On Tuesday they had before them a proposal to appoint a Minister of Education for Wales with a seat in this House, who was to have full control over the new Council in Wales, but on the following Saturday morning changes were introduced sweeping away altogether the words in the Act which provided for a Welsh Minister of Education, and leaving nobody responsible for the direct control of the Welsh Council. Surely that was as important an alteration as was conceivable in any Bill. He submitted that the language addressed by the President of the Board of Trade to the Leader of the Opposition was quite uncalled for. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that in 1902 he advised the present Leader of the Opposition not to go buccaneering with a crew of bishops. He would like to ask the President of the Board of Trade how he liked buccaneering with a crew of legal gentlemen from Wales. On one occasion the right hon. Gentleman having first silenced the proper officers of the ship, took command, but had he steered them successfully? They ought to insist upon having a proper discussion of these important matters. As the Government had changed their mind at the instigation of the Opposition, he respectfully urged that a further opportunity should be given for the discussion of the amended views of the Government, so that if possible they might persuade them to change them to something more useful and suitable.

LORD BALCARRES said he did not know why the Government were objecting to this Motion for recommittal. It seemed to him that under the rule passed by the right hon. Gentleman, even if this Motion were carried, the Report stage would none the less be concluded at 10.30 on Wednesday next. If he was correct in that there could be no Parliamentary objection to the recommital of the Bill He thought a case had been made out for the Motion. He was not going over this Welsh business again beyond saying that the statement that the Amendment on the Paper met the objections of the Opposition was unfounded. They asked for responsibility in this House, and the President of the Board of Trade replied that they had it. But he denied altogether that the Treasury could exercise responsibility for a popularly elected body in Wales. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury had no staff, no officials, no inspectors, and no representatives in Wales to inform him of what was going on there, and therefore he would have no control whatever. The so-called Treasury control would be a pure fiction. With regard to Clause 4, twenty-five Amendments had been put upon the Paper by the Government, which alone was an admission on their part that the clause was in a grotesquely confused state. But those Amendments themselves did not make it any better. They made confusion worse confounded. The clause had become a pure farce, and nobody knew it better than the Minister for Education himself. He demurred to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the Amendments arose out of the debate. One Amendment which did not arise out of the debate was that there should be no appeal under the section after January 1st, 1908. That matter was never discussed at all during the Committee stage. It seemed to him that the Amendment involved not only hardship but injustice. Between the passing of the Bill in November or December and New Year's Day, 1908, the work thrown upon the local education committees and the Board of Education would be something stupendous, and by limiting the time for appeal in the way proposed a real injustice would be done in regard to the Clause 5 schools of the future. There was one other point not of a Party character which made it desirable that the Bill should be recommitted. Hon. Members in all parts of the House were agreed in regard to the teachers, and he submitted that the Bill should be recommitted in order that their case might be considered.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said there had been many fresh Amendments hurled at them in regard to Clause 4, in some cases without notice, with the result that the clause had been materially altered since it was first brought before the House. He had himself given notice of a new clause dealing with the allocation of the rates, and he wanted to say by way of illustration that it referred to a matter which had never been discussed by the House. His new clause was a perfectly possible alternative in connection with Clause 4. As to the allocation of the rates——

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Gentleman is now proposing to discuss the alternative clause. He cannot do that unless this Motion is carried and the House finds itself in Committee on Clause 4.

MR. EVELYN CECIL said he wished to point out that the President of the Board of Education had admitted that there were defects in Clause 4. This alternative clause was a material factor, because it did fill up certain gaps which the House was aware of, gaps which had been admitted by the Minister in charge, but had never been discussed from the point of view of the allocation of the rates. On that ground it seemed to him that Clause 4 ought to be recommitted. The Government had burked very material discussions on many points in connection with Clause 4. They were now preventing any further discussion at this last opportunity which the House might have of making the clause really practical and workable and not illusory. He did not think it was wise for any Government, however large their majority, to provoke opposition by such conduct in dealing with Bills of this character. If so many important clauses were prevented from being discussed, and if Motions to recommit clauses were persistently resisted by the Government, he did not see how they could expect to pass a measure which without certain Amendments would involve great complications and be a source of constant litigation and difficulty. With regard to Clause 25, matters were even worse. The President of the Board of Trade now said that there was no idea of establishing a Minister for Wales, but on Wednesday last the whole tone of the discussion was that a new Minister was to be appointed to preside over and be responsible for the Council for Wales, and that there was to be a Department to which the Minister was to attend. Was it not surprising that the President of the Board of Trade, who had charge of Clause 25, should now state that there was no idea of establishing a new Ministry? It was perfectly evident from the way they had chopped and changed about all the important clauses that the Government did not know their own minds. If there was to be a Minister responsible for education in Wales, the fact ought, to say the least, to have been mentioned in the King's Speech, and the proposal ought to have been brought forward as a separate measure. It was trifling with the House to go on resisting a Motion to recommit a clause of this extremely important character.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR, on a point of order, asked Mr. Speaker's advice and counsel. On Clause 7 there was an Amendment down in the name of the Government which all sections of the House desired to see passed. The Amendment affected the Teachers' Deferred Annuity Fund, and the effect of it would be, he believed, to throw a charge upon the Treasury. He doubted whether under these circumstances it would be competent for the House to deal with the question on the Report stage. The subject was one of great difficulty because the House of Lords could not touch it, and the House of Commons could not touch it at a later stage unless the Bill were recommitted. He begged to ask whether there was any method of recommitting the Bill at the present stage, or what was the best course to adopt in order that the proposal of the Government might be embodied in the Bill?

*MR. SPEAKER said that the point had only just been brought under his attention. He was not yet in a position to say whether the Treasury did or did not give any grant to the teachers out of Parliamentary Funds. According to the

Act of 1898, the Treasury "might according to conditions, grant to such teachers an annual allowance," and so on. There was a later section of the Act which said that the teachers were to contribute to the fund. He had not yet got quite to the bottom of the point as to whether the grant of money was to be made to the teachers out of the Fund which they themselves had supplied, or out of the Fund granted by Parliament. If the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman involved an increased charge which was to come out of the grant voted by Parliament it might be possible, on the Third Reading of the Bill, to recommit it in that respect. Perhaps if the right hon. Gentleman would ask him at a later stage a question on the point he would in the meantime give it his best consideration.

*SIR W. ANSON asked on the point of order, whether this did not start the question that if a teacher was to be allowed to contribute to the Fund for a longer period of time than was originally contemplated, it would follow that he would receive a larger contribution from the Treasury? If that were the case the Bill might impose a larger charge on the taxpayers.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the matter was rather complicated and he would deal with it later on.

Question put, "That this Bill be recommitted in respect of Clauses 4 and 25."

The House divided, Ayes, 146; Noes, 279. (Division List No. 243.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E)
Acland-Hood, Rt.HnSirAlexF.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.HnHughO.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hon.SirH
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.HnA.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down. North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, Capt. W.V.(Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Halpin, J.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(BurySEdm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W, P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonprt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce,J.A.(Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm J(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset-N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Lamb,Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Palmer, Sir Charles Mark
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare

Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mton)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd.
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann.Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J.E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Williamson, A.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJT.(Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*LORD R. CECIL, in moving a new clause for the purpose of providing religious instruction in provided schools notwithstanding Section 14 of the Act of 1870, said that the object of the clause was in effect to repeal the Cowper-Temple clause and to enable local authorities, if they so pleased, to give instruction which should not necessarily exclude the tenets and formularies of any particular religious denomination. The conditions laid down by the Bill were of a very strange character. They produced a state of things which had been described as local option, and no doubt local option was to a certain extent conferred upon the local authorities. Those authorities had control as to the method under which they were to take over the school, as to the method in which they were to pay for it, and as to the method in which they were to afford religious facilities. They could also decide that they would not give religious facilities; but there was one limit placed upon their discretion, a very strange one, invented by the Act of 1870, which provided that they should not teach the tenets and formularies distinctive of any particular religious denomination. He would call the attention of the House to the history of the Cowper-Temple clause. There was no doubt that the clause was assented to by many in 1870 on the ground that it enabled school boards, it was thought, to give any kind of religious instruction they liked, provided they avoided the use of instruction which would bring them within the words "the tenets and formularies of any religious denomination." As time had gone on, however, a very different interpretation had come to prevail, and except in the Lindsey Division of Lincolnshire it had been taken more and more to mean that no definite kind of religion teaching whatever should be given. There were quite a large number of schools in Wales where no religious teaching was given, and there were a certain number of other schools throughout the country in which there was nothing which could really be described as religious teaching. That was not the commonest interpretation of the clause, he was bound to say, because the commonest interpretation of it was to give certain Christian teaching without attaching the children or seeking to attach them to any particular religious denomination. That phase of religious teaching was not only hostile to Roman Catholic ideas but also to those of a large number of Christians who believed that the teaching of a visible and definitely organised Church was essential to Christianity. He thought that some Nonconformists even might accept that view, although others might reject it, and no doubt some members of the Church of England might reject it. Undoubtedly, however, a large number of men all over the world did regard the membership of a visible and organised Church as one of the signs of Christianity. If the matter was gone into deeply it would be found that if this, which many considered to be one of the fundamental axioms of Christianity, were left out in the teaching, something was being taught which, in the view of a large number of people in this country, was hostile to the Christian faith. Having read carefully a number of these syllabuses he observed that it had evidently become impossible to the minds of those who had drawn them to teach not only the whole of the Bible but even the whole of the New Testament. The Cheshire County Council left out the whole of the Gospel of St. John, and he agreed that it was impossible to teach the doctrine embodied in it without teaching matters which were in dispute between those who professed different creeds. He did not think any of the County Councils touched the Epistles of St. Paul. There were, in fact, certain portions of the Bible which could not be taught under Cowper-Templeism, and that seemed to him to be a very distinct objection to this form of teaching. He thought it tended more and more to teach Christian morality, which was, of course, founded upon Christian doctrine, without teaching the doctrine itself. This was a matter in which a certain amount of freedom must be allowed. When they found a certain number of children wished a more definite teaching, or where all the children wished for a more definite teaching, or where they found a particular district would like Nonconformist teaching and another undenominational teaching, the right thing was to give the local authority freedom in the matter and let them teach, subject to the Conscience Clause, that which the children most desired. That was the object of the clause he ventured to move, and although he was conscious that the subject was one that would only be imperfectly dealt with owing to the restricted limits of the discussion, he commended the clause to the House.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said he was glad to second the clause of the noble Lord both for the reasons given, which could not but weigh very seriously with the House, and for a reason which would be of great importance, the practical administration of this Bill by the county councils. At present there might be three schools in the same district, one serving the Jewish, one the Roman Catholic, and one the Church of England sections of the population. There might even be a fourth school where Cowper-Temple teaching was taught. If this Bill passed it was clear that to none of those schools would facilities be given to teach the religion it desired. Instead of pleasing those three sections of the population the Bill would thrust Cowper-Templeism down their throats. The result would be that instead of a benefit being conferred a great injustice would be created where before the passing of the Bill no injustice existed.

New clause :—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in section fourteen of the Education Act, 1870, religious instruction in a public elementary school may include instruction in the tenets and formularies of any religious denomination."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) thought the House was indebted to the noble Lord for his frank and temperate statement of a body of opinion which undoubtedly was held by a great many persons in the country, and of which he was the distinguished representative and champion. The debate would have been incomplete, the controversy would not have been properly developed or properly stated, if the noble Lord had not moved this clause. Referring to the history of the Cowper-Temple clause, he said he had recently seen a statement describing Mr. Cowper-Temple as a Radical M.P. and an enemy of denominational education. As a matter of fact, Mr. Cowper-Temple was a member of the Church Education Union, which took up the case for religious church education as against the Birmingham school, which took up the case for secular education. There could be no greater delusion than to suppose that the Cowper-Temple clause was introduced either for or by Nonconformists. On the contrary, its object was to prevent Nonconformists from denominationalising the national schools in their own interest by means of school boards. The noble Lord said the clause was originally intended to provide for denominational education *minus* formulas. If that was so, it was significant that the local authorities had found themselves quite unable to give effect to it. They felt that it was not for them to undertake the duties of strictly and specifically denominational teaching. The noble Lord said he was going to leave it to the local authority to choose the denomination to which it would hand over the school. What did that mean ? The noble Lord's doctrine was not only that they could not teach general morality, because without Christianity they were unable to enforce it by sacred sanction, but that, in order to have Christianity effective, they must have membership of a visible and organised church. How would that doctrine be applied under this new clause ? The local authorities must make it their business, if they were to teach Christianity at all, to teach every child to belong to that particular denomination which they had selected. The noble Lord could not escape from the consequences of his proposal. Either they were leaving the local authority to choose or they were not. If they left the local authority to choose, then, in order to make efficient Christians, it must attach all the children in the area to some definite, organised, visible branch of the Church of Christ, and it had to choose the branch. ["No."] Then who was to choose it ?

LORD R. CECIL: The parents of the children, of course.

SIR W. ROBSON said that was a different proposition from the proposition in the clause. Did it come back to the question of the right of entry, of all-round facilities ? He understood the noble Lord's proposition to be that the duty should be cast upon the local authority of seeing that the children were made into good Christians ; attached to some branch of a definite, visible, organised Church. They could not have four or five schools in a village to correspond to the different denominations. Yet, unless they had, according to the noble Lord's proposal, that village must be deprived of the teaching of Christianity, for children must either be denominationally taught or not at all. The noble Lord was ranging himself on the side of the secularists. It was a case of extremes meeting. The noble Lord had once complained of a syllabus of a local authority in which the word "Church" was defined as meaning the whole body of the Christian Church—all who conceived themselves to be followers of Christ. Under the noble Lord's clause the local authorities were to become ecclesiastical authorities. If they were to teach anything to the children who did not desire to be taught by the clergy of the parish, what were they to teach ? They must select some body of Christian doctrine. Did the noble Lord think they would select a definition of the word "Church" that would please him ? Let the noble Lord and his friends well consider what it meant to put these theological options and powers into the hands of the local authorities. Whatever Church suffered—and probably they would all suffer—that Church which the noble Lord represented would undoubtedly suffer the most. What had been felt throughout the English villages had been this—not that the Nonconformist children objected to the teaching of the Catechism, but that they did object to a definition of the word Church, which put the teaching of Christ on an organised basis involving apostolic succession and which of necessity relegated their own communities to an inferior spiritual basis. That might be sound doctrine, but it was doctrine which the State could not undertake to teach. The noble Lord spoke only for the Anglican Church. He should like to know what hon. Members who spoke for the Catholic Church said about giving the local authorities these theological powers? He thought the Catholics would find that the tender mercies of the Anglicans were cruel. He was delighted to find this new temper in regard to municipalities. Some time ago the Leader of the Opposition treated with scorn what he called municipal religion, or, at all events, he gave it a name which was rather intended to provoke ideas of scorn. But now, municipalities under this clause were both to make and to choose religion. The Government desired to save them from any such position. The essence of the Bill was to put the teaching of religious dogma on a specific basis. Let them leave that if they liked to the Church. But they thought it was right and just that they should give the children some teaching of that moral kind which the noble Lord appeared to regard with some apprehension. They believed it was possible out of Christianity to select those fundamental doctrines which might be taught with advantage to all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought there was one observation which fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman with which probably every hon. Member would agree. The hon. and learned Gentleman recognised that the debate initiated by his noble friend was inevitable, and that no more important debate could be carried on in connection with an Education Bill. He entirely agreed with that proposition, and it was really because they had had no such Amendment before them hitherto that so much of their debate had glided over the surface of the controversy, and so much which really penetrated to the root of the matter had been precluded by the rules. Although he held the same view as that taken by the Solicitor-General on these points, he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman had taken far too restricted a view of the issue raised by the Amendment. He had confined his argument simply to the difficulties which no doubt did accompany any attempt to make the local authority teach denominational religion, pay for denominational religion, and decide what denominational religion should be taught. That, no doubt, was one possibility which would arise under the clause, but it was not the only possibility. It was a plan which, as a matter of fact, was carried out at this moment in Scotland. He did not think the Scottish system was, in all respects, applicable to England, but he could not admit for one moment that a system which had, on the whole, worked well and smoothly in Scotland was one which should be dismissed without careful consideration by the Committee. But this Amendment did not make it obligatory on, it did not even suggest to, the local authority itself to teach or to pay for denominational religion. He did not associate himself with those who attempted to minimise the value of Cowper-Temple teaching. On the contrary, he should like to see some such teaching made obligatory in every school, or, at all events, in the great mass of schools. He did not mean in the Clause 4 schools. At least he should like to provide that no school should be without religious teaching, and that if there were not to be denominational teaching there should be Cowper-Temple teaching. This clause did not militate against that view. It did not suggest that Cowper-Temple teaching should be excluded from the schools. What it said was, "Do not put on the State-provided schools an arbitrary limitation which is not known in Germany, which is not known in Scotland, and which need not be known in this country." It cleared the way, it freed the ground. It enabled them to think of other solutions of the religious difficulty than the solution embodied in the Act of 1870 and continued in the Act of 1902. But the solution both of 1870 and of 1902 had this great disadvantage, that it left certain grievances—practical grievances in some cases, theoretical grievances in many cases—unredressed. It left the Nonconformist in the single school area, where there was only a church school, face to face with the necessity of sending his child to that school or to no school at all. In the districts where there were board and church schools, it required the denominationalists, whether

Roman Catholic, Church of England, or Wesleyan, to pay rates to support the provided schools and also to find the funds necessary to keep going the denominational schools. Those two grievances the Act of 1870 created, and the Act of 1902 continued, but they were grievances on different sections of the community. It was a compromise that might have worked well on the whole—had it been allowed to work well—it was not a compromise more in favour of one party than another. By what they were doing now they were destroying that arrangement altogether. They were taking away the whole of the Nonconformist grievance. [" No."] What Nonconformist grievance remained? [" Clause 4 schools."] Over every district in the country with less than 5,000 population, what grievance, in the opinion of Nonconformists, was left by this Bill?

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) reminded the right hon. Gentleman of the training colleges.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said Nonconformist training colleges had just as good a position as those of the church. Under the Act of 1902 ample provision was made for the creation of training colleges on an undenominational basis. Putting that on one side, undoubtedly this Bill did leave the whole of the denominational grievance as it existed under the Acts of 1870 and 1902, unredressed and enormously added to. That was briefly why this Bill could not stand, and it would be observed that that was intimately connected with the fact that the Government insisted on keeping the Cowper-Temple clause in all provided schools, and to a large extent applying it to other schools, while they handed over all denominational schools to the local authority. Was it not obvious that if they were really going to settle this controversy they must try to settle it on an intelligible basis? The Government were not doing so. The Acts of 1870 and 1902 were admittedly a compromise, and if the Government were going to do away with the system under those Acts, they must substitute something that was understood. There were only two plans, and both of them involved his noble friend's Amendment and both involved some modification of the Cowper-Temple clause. The first was the Scottish system, which was attacked by the hon. and learned Gentleman in a manner that indicated that he had for the moment forgotten that it was the Scottish system. That system had really established popular control. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had spent a large portion of their time during the last two years in discussing popular control; but there could be no such thing so long as they kept to the Cowper-Temple clause, which was in the very nature of the case a limitation of the freedom of the local authority. If they were to have the principle of local control, that required his noble friend's Amendment, however it was interpreted. Popular control inevitably involved a modification of the Cowper-Temple clause. He doubted whether any practical statesman would be well advised in attempting to introduce the Scottish system. He thought it would lead to a great deal of trouble and difficulty, and, though it did embody a system of popular control, and that alone, he did not himself press it on the Government. The scheme he did press on the Government if they refused to adopt the old system of 1870 in its remodelled shape under the Act of 1902, was parental control—the parental management and responsibility for the religious teaching of their children. That also involved as a necessary and inevitable consequence a modification of the Cowper-Temple clause. He was not recommending any particular plan, but he said there ought to be no school in the country in which by law it was impossible for a child to learn the form of religion its parent required it to learn. The Cowper-Temple clause laid it down by statute that there were to be a large number of schools provided out of public funds in which a considerable portion of the children of the country were not to learn the religion their parents required. No such provision should be in the statute-book. It was absolutely inconsistent with parental authority and not only with local control If the Government meant to upset the old arrangement they must go deeper into the problem and try to touch the foundation on which religious education was built and adopt either local control or parental control, both of which required his noble friend's Amendment. He believed they would have to come to some form of parental intervention, of which this Bill might be a suggestion, but which it did not carry out. They would have to consider the large mass of the population consisting of Roman Catholics, Jews, Anglicans, and, he thought, many Wesleyans, who told them quite plainly that they wanted for their children a particular sort of instruction. If it was in their power to give them that, it was their business to do it; and it could not be done, obviously, so long as the Cowper-Temple clause was kept in its integrity. He had considered and reconsidered this question until he was weary of it, and he was more and more driven to the conclusion that, if the Government were resolved to upset the whole of the 1870 to 1902 arrangement, they must find something which was defensible. Nothing they had suggested was effective except giving to the parents of the children some power to obtain for them the religious education they desired. He did not mean that it was necessary to make the local education authority the judges of the merits of the instruction or do anything but sincerely and impartially aid—not financially, but by starting a school and otherwise—parents to obtain for their children that religious instruction which they desired. It was for the parents, not for the local authority, to deal with these niceties, with these theological views as to the particular character of the religious instruction which ought to be given. If the Government pursued the course they were apparently pursuing, they would be saying to the parents, "You are Anglicans. The English Church is Protestant. We know what Protestantism is, and your children shall be taught what we consider Protestantism." That was the exact position taken up by the Christian Church in the Middle Ages and in this country laid down by the Act of Uniformity. That was the exact theory which had animated persecutors. It animated the Presbyterians when they turned out the Anglican clergy during the Civil War and the Anglicans when they came back after the Civil War and turned out the Presbyterians. It was a theory for which there was a great deal to be said centuries ago but which he thought all civilised mankind had agreed to abandon. Let them not have a new Act of Uniformity. Let them not lay down a certain kind of religious teaching and say it should be approved by the parents and they should have it. That was not in conformity with universally accepted modern doctrines, nor was it likely to succeed now. He believed now that the Government had cast themselves adrift from the old compromise and arrangements, they would have, whether they liked it or not, to come to some form of organisation of religious teaching which would permit parents to obtain, not merely the help of the local authority, but their active assistance in getting the kind of teaching they desired; and if that was so, and if he was right in the prophecy he now ventured to make to the House, then he said that the beginning of wisdom in this matter was to recognise that the Cowper-Temple clause must be modified. It was for these reasons, while he was in no sense hostile to the Cowper-Temple clause teaching, and passed no word of criticism upon it that, if his noble friend went to a division, he would assuredly be found voting for him.

DR. MACNAMARA observed that the right hon. Gentleman had stated that this Bill would not stand. He thought it would stand. The right hon. Gentleman had developed a new zeal on behalf of the parents.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

DR. MACNAMARA: Well, he would say the right hon. Gentleman had his old affection for the parents as strong as it was in 1902, when the hon. Member for East Mayo asked with regard to the proposal for four trustee managers that two should represent the public and two the parents.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR reminded the hon. Gentleman that in the discussions on the Act of 1902 he stated over and over again that it was based on and contained the old compromise, and therefore he did not think it was necessary to introduce so difficult a modification as that which was involved in the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Mayo. Any one who had listened to his innumerable speeches must be quite aware that the views he had given that night were in harmony with all he had said before.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he would put this other point. The right hon. Gentleman said they had no right to say to parents, "This is a religion which your children must be taught." He wondered why he said that in 1902, when he was aware that there were a vast number of villages where Nonconformists had to send their children to Church schools.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Did I not say in the speech I have just delivered that I always recognised the Nonconformist grievance? [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] You may think me hypocritical, but I stated it over and over again in 1902.

Dr. MACNAMARA said the right hon. Gentleman stated quite emphatically and deliberately that the Government had no right to say to parents, "This is the religion you must have your children taught." They were not doing so. For the first time they were setting up freedom. Parents need not send their children to it if they did not like it. This Bill would give all sorts of facilities for other teaching, and an assurance was given that, at any rate, if the teachers gave the instruction, it would be given by honest and sincere men, because the teachers did not require to give it unless they liked. He thought that made in the direction of freedom. On the other hand, what the right hon. Gentleman said in 1902 in regard to the Nonconformist villages, where any number of Nonconformist children were compelled to attend Church schools, was that they must have this religious teaching. The right hon. Gentleman was showing a growing regard for Cowper-Temple teaching. He was inclined to be sorry that closure by compartments was in operation, because if the debates went on long enough he might see the right hon. Gentleman going arm in arm with Dr. Clifford to Exeter Hall to speak in praise of Cowper-Temple teaching. He did not agree with the view that the Scottish system was possible under this Amendment. This was the right of entry all round masquerading under the cloak of the local education authority. That flagrantly broke up the settlement of 1870, one of the bases of which was that the moment rates were touched for education, denominational teaching could not be given out of them. The right hon. Gentleman in 1902 set aside that principle, and what was now being done was to set it up again. Beyond that, facilities were provided under the auspices of the denomination. The system of 1870 was in fact extended in the interests of the denominationalists, and he thought some of them had been rather ungrateful. He did not understand the position of the Leader of the Opposition. When a similar Amendment was moved in 1902 the right hon. Gentleman said he had had some idea of bringing forward a provision of his own dealing with the same point, but explained reasons which had prevented him from taking such a course. No compulsion was applied to parents. If it had been, however, it was a fact shown by thirty-six years experience that the bulk of parents were satisfied with Cowper-Temple teaching. At Dulwich, for instance, there was an infant department conducted by the Church associated with boys' and girls' departments conducted by the public education authority. After receiving Church teaching the children passed under the board school system and all went on harmoniously. Hands would not be allowed to be laid on the board schools, whether in that House or another place. There might be some Amendments which must be accepted, but hands must be kept off the board schools. They had won those schools in the teeth of great opposition; they had won public control for them, perfect freedom, and a system of Bible-teaching which satisfied the bulk of parents, but from which parents could be relieved if they desired, and they would not have anybody coming into those schools to upset the harmony which existed. Some compromises might have to be accepted, but so far as he was concerned there must be no touching the board schools. A compromise on those lines could not be accepted from that House or any other quarter.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said it was quite clear from the speeches of the Solicitor-General and the hon. Member for North Camberwell that they entirely misunderstood the Amendment. The Solicitor-General had told the House that it would be a restriction of freedom to impose on the local authority a duty which did not rest on them—something that they must perform whether they were willing or not. It was nothing of the kind. It was opening to them an option which was taken away by the present restriction to Cowper-Temple teaching—a liberty which they might or might not exercise. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had told them that this was merely a revival of facilities all round. This was the very opposite of his own desire. What he wished was that this freedom should be exercised not merely by giving facilities, but, if necessary, by having separate schools. He was not going to discuss the Cowper-Temple clause. On the Opposition side of the House they had said over and over again that they saw much to praise in much of the teaching given under that clause; they saw that much good might occasionally be done under that system, but they asserted that that good was possible only, in Mr. Gladstone's words, so long as it was supplemented by something more free and more definite in the voluntary schools. Referring to the syllabuses, he pointed out that in the absence of any guarantee that the teaching would not be pared down, it might become little more than ethical. There was another aspect of this question to which he ventured to call attention. Our example would tell, he believed, in the Colonies and throughout the Empire. The question of education throughout the Empire was occupying our administrators as much as, if not more than anything else. Could not we reach some common principle which should lie at the base of it all? In the Orange River Colony, in the Transvaal, in Natal, and in Rhodesia, he found the same complaint, viz., that they had not sufficient liberty of choice, which liberty was more necessary in regard to religious education than in regard to anything else. He had had a conversation with General Botha lasting between two and three hours, in which the General urged the absolute necessity of all creeds in South Africa having free and full recognition in their schools; and he declared that the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, the Anglicans, and the Jews had the same aspirations in that respect. It was on these considerations that he urged upon the House to find, if possible, a principle which would not only permit a satisfactory solution here, but would serve as an example to all parts of the Empire, and bind together the Mother country and the Colonies in one common principle which might guide our educational work—the principle of religious freedom.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said that the feeling in his constituency was that, as this was a Protestant country, there should be given to the children only simple religious teaching, not theological teaching. Nobody really wished to teach theology to little children; even the clergy did not. "Oh, oh."] Well, very few of them. He believed if the words "religious" and "theological" were substituted for the words "undenominational" and "denominational," it would simplify their discussion. He did not believe there was that feeling in the country in regard to the teaching of theology to children which was represented in some quarters in the House, and at certain meetings outside. In fact, he believed that those meetings which had been held in the country were directed not against this Bill, but to an imaginary Bill for secular education. Even in Lancashire they could not get up this protest against the Government Bill without organising a cheap trip to London. His own belief was that Protestant parents everywhere would accept what was called Cowper-Temple teaching; and that Nonconformists had no animosity towards Roman Catholics or Jews. Nonconformists recognised that the children of these sects should receive the religious teaching which their parents desired when there was a sufficient number. He felt that if they did not accept what was given by the Bill, there was no other resource except what was called secular education.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he wished to say one or two words in order to show why it was that most of the Irish Members would vote for the noble Lord's Amendment when he went to a division. He had heard the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition say that he had no very great objection to Cowper-Temple teaching; indeed, that he rather approved of it under certain circumstances; and that he regarded it as much better than secular teaching. He understood that that was the attitude of hon. Gentlemen belonging to the Protestant religion. But those who represented Catholic feeling in the House were entitled to take a different view of the matter. They claimed that they should not be asked to pay a single farthing of the rates for the promotion of what was, after all, Protestant religion. He did not blame hon. gentlemen on either side of the house, whether they belonged to the Church of England or to the Nonconformist bodies, for favouring Cowper-Temple teaching; but it was hard to ask Catholic ratepayers to spend their money for the teaching of Protestant religion which was very essentially opposed to the teaching of the Catholic Church. The special position of Catholics ought to be recognised, and they were entitled to make a protest against any arrangement the result of which would compel Catholic parents to pay rates for the teaching of a religion which was in almost every respect opposed to that which they believed. It had been proposed that the rates which the Catholics paid should be spent upon the support of their own schools; and that in the same way the rates paid by other denominations should be devoted to assist the religious teaching which they wished in the schools. He thought that that would be an ideal arrangement; but he understood that it could not be accomplished. He supposed that at this stage it would be impossible for any very large change to be made in the Bill to meet the views of those for whom he spoke; but he believed that although facilities were granted under Clause 4 to Catholics for their denominational teaching, a number of Catholic schools would be excluded, and that that would constitute a grievance. He appealed to the Minister for Education before this Bill became law, to prevent the injustice of calling upon a considerable section of the population to pay for the teaching of religion to which they were strongly opposed. If that were not done there would be considerable difficulties. He himself did not desire that there should be any unpleasantness of the kind, but he believed that a considerable number of ratepayers would refuse to pay their rates if they saw that their money was devoted to paying for a religion in which they did not believe. They had heard a good deal about passive resisters, but large numbers of people did not believe in passive resistance. Their resistance would be of an active character, and would prove that this Bill was not a final settlement of the education question.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said the hon. Member for East Clare, as representing the Roman Catholics, had told them that he objected to paying for the instruction of a religion in which he did not believe. There were also a number of Members on the Ministerial side of the House who had the strongest possible objection to paying for the teaching of the Roman Catholic religion of which the hon. Member was an exceptionally strong exponent in this House. [MR. W. REDMOND: What about the "all-round system."] He was well aware of what was said about the "all-round system" under which everybody paid for everybody else, but under that system, according to the hon. Gentleman, they were violating everybody's consciences. He saw in the hon. Gentleman's speech no argument in support of the Amendment, although the Amendment still stood in the obscurity in which the noble Lord left it. He gathered that under it instruction might be given by the local education authority in any and every religion. Therefore the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down would find that from a Roman Catholic point of view he would gain nothing from the proposal, as under it the religion he objected to would be given. He had listened to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition with considerable attention, but he did not gather from it what this Amendment really meant. It was not said who was to give this education, it was not said whether it was to be given in school hours, it was not said whether it was to be given at the public expense, and he contended that until they knew definitely what an Amendment of that kind meant, it was not fair at this stage of the debate to bring forward a proposal which was so evidently against the chance of their forming an opinion upon a clear and definite issue. At an earlier date they had had put forward the cold, clear, and definite pronouncement from Birmingham that religious instruction should not be given at the public expense, but should be given in school hours. That raised a clear issue in regard to the all-round system. The State was to marshal the children to school, and then during school hours the different ministers of religion were to enter like recruiting sergeants and see what they could get. That was a clear issue, and the proposal was rejected, although the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition was perfectly ready to vote for it on the ground that it got rid of Cowper-Temple teaching. The Unionist Party at the time of the Birmingham Amendment committed themselves very nearly to the proposal that the State had nothing to do with the furnishing of religious education, and that its sole function was to bring children to school, and there to leave them to the tender mercies of the emissaries of the different denominations. That was a most curious reversal of political traditions, because if there was one thing which that great ecclesiastical statesman, Mr. Gladstone—distinguishing between him as a theologian and a politician—held that the State had nothing to do with the propagation of religion. It seemed then as if the Opposition side of the House were prepared to adopt Gladstonian traditions, but the Leader of the Opposition had abandoned that position, and now, so far from condemning Cowper-Templeism, he spoke of it with modified enthusiasm. He almost went so far as to say that he wished to see a kind of form of Cowper-Templeism compulsorily established in every school, if something else was not established there. They would welcome from the Leader of the Opposition that declaration, especially if he spoke with the whole force of his Party. He was surprised to hear Cowper-Templeism spoken of as a new religion. It was new in the sense that it enables Christians of all denominations to agree upon the fundamental truths of Christianity. The existing syllabuses had been received by the present authorities from the old school boards, and they bore all the marks of compromise, but they had not eliminated any of the verities of the Christian faith. He was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman had risen to support the Amendment, because under the Bill hon. Gentlemen of the Opposition had been generously treated, and if there were offended consciences left they had no reason to complain. They on that side adhered to Cowper Templeism, because it went in the direction of the extrusion of religious controversy from our schools, and accentuated the fact that Christians could agree.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) was sorry that he could not follow his noble friend into the lobby on this occa ion. He sympathised with him in his desire for denominational education and on his condemnation of the Bill for not providing it. In so far as the noble Lord's remarks were directed against the Bill on that ground they had his most hearty support. The Bill did not provide for such teaching, but upset an arrangement entered into many years ago, which in spite of its manifold inefficiencies had been accepted as giving the basis of some kind of religious instruction. The Amendment, however, appeared to tear up the *concordat* which was entered into in 1870, and which had worked very well up to this time. There was no doubt that the Cowper-Temple clause imposed restrictions upon religious teaching, but it was the price they had paid, and not unwillingly paid to avoid a quarter of a century of religious strife in all the districts of the country. He was willing to believe that good and effective religious teaching had been given in spite of the Cowper-Temple clause, but that had been owing very much to the fact, which he was sorry to say no longer existed, that board schools had been in competition side by side with denominational or non provided schools. There had, therefore, been a stimulus and a rivalry which had kept up the character of the teaching of the board schools, and there had also been a large number of teachers trained in the denominational colleges who had tended to raise the character of religious teaching in the schools. Now that the schools were to be all of one type there would no longer be that stimulus, and in the restrictions put upon the teacher preventing them from having the liberty of teaching the religion in which they believed there was a danger that the character of the teacher, as regarded religious teaching, would be very much deteriorated and the supply of such teachers very much diminished. He recognised all these objections, but he asked were they prepared to get rid of this system, which, in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, laid a foundation upon which the ample teaching of the Christian faith could be raised? It was because he believed the Amendment would destroy the working of the Cowper-Temple clause that he could not support the noble Lord.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) appealed to the House to come to a decision on the Amendment. The noble Lord forgot one fact—namely, that they were discussing the religious education of children between five and twelve, and not teaching suitable for theological students at the University. The noble Lord had complained that the County syllabuses made selections from the Bible. Did the noble Lord teach his children all the Bible? Was he prepared to put the Bible as it was into the hands of little children?

LORD R. CECIL: Certainly.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: He also made matter of complaint against simple Bible-teaching, that in some syllabuses the Epistles were not included. He should rather praise that. He should have thought it a very difficult thing to make children between five and twelve understand the argumentative Epistles around which had arisen some of the greatest controversies of the Church.

LORD R. CECIL: Would the right hon. Gentleman exclude all the Epistles? They are all excluded.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said he did not know the reason which might have induced the authors of the syllabuses to exclude all the Epistles. But he would not labour that. His first point was that this was teaching for children of between five and twelve. His second was that this simple Bible-teaching had prevailed for thirty-six years, and there had been no well-founded complaint about it on the part of the parents, or a sign of dissatisfaction on their part with regard to this teaching. The noble Lord had dwelt a great deal upon the right of the parents; had he forgotten that there were a large number of parents—hundreds of thousands, if not more—who were absolutely indifferent to all religious teaching whatsoever? Was he prepared to go into the slums of London, where drunkenness and its attendant social evils prevailed, and say that there the parents were to determine the religious teaching?

LORD R. CECIL: Certainly.

* SIR HENRY FOWLER: If the noble Lord accepted that he (Sir Henry Fowler) had nothing further to say upon it. What the noble Lord really meant when he talked of the right of the parents was the right of the parents in certain limited localities and areas. To talk of the right of parents being interfered with either by this Bill or the Act of 1870, was not to deal with the facts as they were. In the large towns there was ample provision for all the religious teaching that the parents desired. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition laid great stress on the Scottish system, but Scotland was free from one great difficulty in that it had one common Catechism. There were divisions in the Scottish Church; as they all knew from the great controversy which arose last year, but they were divisions as to the internal government of the Church and not as to its doctrines. The Scottish system could not be introduced into England, otherwise he should not be indisposed to consider that argument. The Leader of the Opposition had said they were destroying by this Bill the settlement or compromise of 1870 and the settlement of 1902. The settlement and compromise of 1870 was destroyed

long ago. It was based on the three points that the education of the country was to be provided as to one-third by the supporters of the voluntary schools, one third by the taxes and one-third by the fees from the children. Two of those points of the settlement had broken down, and the right hon. Gentleman himself broke down the settlement of 1870 altogether when he put the voluntary schools on the rates. He warned the noble Lord that he and his anglican friends in the attitude they had taken up were really aiming a deadly blow at the continued maintenance of religious teaching in our national schools. The country would not have the noble Lord's solution. [An HON. MEMBER: You will see.] They had said leave it to the settlement arrived at in 1870. Leave it to the local authorities to decide the religious teaching to be given in the schools, subject to the condition that the school authorities should not be allowed to influence a child or take a child away from the Church to which the child's parents belonged. It was stated that in some single-school areas, children had been told that if their parents had been married in a Nonconformist chapel they were not really married at all. That was the sort of grievance of which Nonconformists had reason to complain. This Bill would stop that; at the same time, those who desired specific religious teaching would have their full rights reserved.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) contended that it did not lie in the mouths of the authors of this Bill to charge its opponents with taking a course which might lead to religious instruction being excluded from the elementary schools. The supporters of the Bill would leave religious instruction to be determined by bodies elected for totally different purposes, and they washed the hands of this House of all responsibility for the school life of the children. There was no justification for the taunt of the right hon. Gentleman. His argument came to this—that the strength of the case of the opponents of this Bill depended on the amount of contribution which those who believed in Church teaching were prepared to give to the general education of the country. They paid taxes and rates on precisely the same basis as those who favoured Cowper-Temple teaching, but a kind of blackmail was to be levied upon them in order that their consciences might receive the same satisfaction. That proved the fallacy of the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's argument. The right hon. Gentleman had said that under the Cowper-Temple system the whole of the Bible was not taught, and he asked the noble Lord whether he was prepared to teach the whole of the Bible. If selections were necessary—and he admitted they were—in teaching the Bible to children, did not that strengthen their claim that those who agreed with them as well as those who disagreed with them should have the right of selection? If selection were necessary it became more necessary to safeguard the conscience of those who thought that the Bible had to be taught, and could not be put haphazard into the hands of any child. It was not enough to say that under this Cowper-Temple system certain portions of the Bible were excluded which they wished to have excluded. Whether by purpose or accident, it was the case that many of the most sacred and beautiful passages of the Bible did not find a place within that scheme of teaching, as they thought, because they were parts of the Liturgy of the Church. They resented that, not in the least in respect of those who wished to have the Bible selected, but because they said that if those who were not of their way of thinking had the right of excluding those passages, they themselves had the right of including those passages in schools built by Church money for Church teaching.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said they would have that under the Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM altogether denied that those who built these schools for Church teaching were bound to take advantage of the precarious opportunities given in the later stages of this Bill. They claimed equality. The right hon. Member for Wolverhampton went on to say that this kind of religious teaching had prevailed for thirty-six years. But it had prevailed side by side with the kind of religious instruction for which great sacrifices had been made. If the Government were going to destroy the machinery for giving the kind of instruction the Opposition preferred, or if the Government were going to cramp and restrict their opportunities of giving such instruction, at any rate they were bound to aim at theoretic equality. They were told that in practice these difficulties which figured so largely in debates in this House would disappear. They would disappear for a moment, but they would revive if the complaint was one of theoretic equality, because all those who felt the injustice and could point to that which was inequitable in the law of the land would use that as a lever to work upon the consciences and the minds of their fellow-countrymen. If this Bill became an Act in its present shape, they could depend upon it that not only in the country school but in all the large industrial centres there would be many men who would feel it a matter of duty to use all the argument they could as to the iniquities of this Bill, and its passing would be a stimulus to men and women to search their consciences and decide whether they were doing enough to see that their children received that instruction which in their hearts they believed ought to be given. The prospect was not one to which any of them would look forward with pleasure or with anything but anxiety and foreboding. They said that if the Government made this Bill theoretically just the practical difficulties would be far less than they were under previous Acts which were not quite theoretically just. The Act of 1870 was a compromise; so was the Act of 1902. Both, by the frank admission of their authors, left in certain places conditions which were unjust as well as conditions which were harsh. Were the Government going to amend that state of affairs by passing a Bill which in every corner was unjust to those who preferred Church teaching to Cowper-Temple teaching? If the Act of 1902 was to be denied by supporters of the present Government as being in the nature of a compromise, then their duty was to aim at something which was more just, and not at something which was obviously less just. There were only two forms of theoretic justice which could stand. One was to do that which the Government proposed to do and did not do, namely, to give to the local authority the power to choose the kind of religious instruction it preferred; and the other was to leave it to the parents to decide whether their children should receive the instruction which they preferred. He believed they would be driven to the second alternative, and he hoped that even now the House would adopt the advice of his noble friend and save themselves and it might be the next generation from years of barren conflict and religious animosity.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said some hon. friends seemed to think that there would be no longer Cowper-Temple teaching if this Amendment were carried. That was not the case. It would only be abolished in those cases where people did not want it. Their one object was to prevent Cowper-Temple teaching being forced upon those who did not want it. The Amendment would let those who wanted Cowper-Temple teaching for their children go on with it. If this Bill were passed there would be a considerable number of voluntary schools in rural districts where the children of every parent would like to continue definite religious teaching as it was given now, but unless this Amendment were accepted that could not be done. Was that the idea of justice and freedom which hon. Gentlemen opposite wished to uphold? This would be making not a majority or a minority, but the whole of the children in the school suffer. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman at least to consider some means by which this great injustice could be avoided in those parishes where every child wished to go on with the teaching as at present.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 114. Noes, 254. (Division List No. 244.)

AYES.

Abraham, William, (Cork, N.E.
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John

M. Wyndham.

Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E.Feetham(Lewisham
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Ginnell, L.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall
Ropner, Col. Sir Robert
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Bridgeman.

NOES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott(Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbo'rne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Dev'np'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Causton, Rt.HnRichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S.PancrasW.
Corbett, CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (StPancrasN.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford,S.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M (Aberdeen, W.
Higham, John Sharp
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, GeorgeD.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras, E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, William
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfork,E.
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, SirC.E(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson,J.W.H.(S'mers't,E.
Tillet, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said that as the House had just decided against any modification of the Cowper-Temple teaching they might very well ask that Cowper-Templeism should be defined He did not desire to lay down any very decided definition, and so had selected the Christian faith as set forth in the Apostles' Creed. Why he emphasised the Apostles' Creed was because the description given by Mr. Cowper-Temple in 1870 was that he only meant the clause to apply to formularies characteristic of any particular denomination, and he considered that the Apostles' Creed was not characteristic of any particular religion, but was a common doctrine of the Christian religion. He wanted to get at the bed-rock of this question so that the parents of all denominations would know what they had to build upon. Therefore it was necessary for them to take some action of this sort. He found that in many syllabuses they started with a sort of instruction to the teachers the effect of which was that in many cases they would find that Christianity had been dropped, and moral training had been adopted as the standard. If that was the common practice now, and if that was the instruction which had gone forth to the teachers in the past, it was very necessary to provide for the future. The two main reasons why the standard of Cowper-Temple teaching had been kept up in the past were the facts that there had been competition with the denominational schools and that the teachers were instructed in denominational training colleges. Those two reasons would be removed under this Bill, and therefore he thought it was essential that they should see that the Christian religion as defined by the Apostles' Creed was taken as the standard. This was only in accordance with everything that had been said on the Ministerial Benches during the discussions on this measure, because again and again it had been asserted that the parents were satisfied with the religious teaching given under the existing syllabuses. They had scotched secular teaching for a considerable time and the House had decided most decisively against a secular system. In a very large number of schools the children were going to have for three days in the week Cowper-Temple teaching, whilst on two days they would receive the religious teaching associated with their own denomination. Surely they had a right to insist that the Cowper-Temple teaching should be Christian teaching which would form a basis for denominational teaching. He was not at all favourable to Clause 3, but if they had to abide by it then he thought it was only fair to those who were being transferred from schools in which they were receiving denominational teaching that they should be assured that they would receive on three days a week instruction which was not contrary to what they had been given on the other two days, and something which should be the foundation for denominational teaching. This was not in any sense a controversial question, and it was not altering the Cowper-Temple clause, but simply defining it in the sense in which Mr. Cowper-Temple himself defined it. It was setting up a standard which had been accepted by Christians through all ages, and by adopting this Amendment the Government would only be accepting what was really the intention of Parliament in 1870, because at that time there was no idea of abolishing the Apostles' Creed from the syllabus. By adopting this proposal there would be some guarantee that the children would receive religious teaching which would form a solid foundation to build upon. He begged to move.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) in seconding the Motion, said this new clause must not be taken as disparaging in any degree what was known as Cowper-Temple teaching. Had the discussion which took place earlier been adverse to that teaching he should have submitted arguments to show his confidence in the Cowper-Temple clause, and to testify his high sense of the service it had done in regard to religious education. He thought some definition like that given in the clause proposed by his noble friend was required. It could not be injurious, and it would express the mind of Parliament. In cases where members of the local education authority might hesitate in their judgment they would at least have before them this expression of the views of Parliament on the teaching of religion. As to the term "Christian faith" used in the new clause, he would remind the House that these were familiar words to educationists. They appeared scores of times in the schemes of the Endowed Schools Commissioners, and they had received the sanction of the House, because when the schemes were laid before Parliament no objection had been taken. Then as to the Apostles' Creed he would say that it was the simplest formulary which Christian men knew. He doubted if any proposition in that Creed was denied by any believer in any form of the Christian faith. It might be stated with some little show of reason that Parliament ought not to give any direction to the local authorities. He reminded the House that it was only a few days since they inserted words in Clause 2, providing that an arrangement between the parties should not prevent their giving an undertaking to give religious instruction under the Cowper-Temple clause. So far as he knew that was the first time a direct instruction had been given to the education authority in regard to the teaching of religion. This teaching was to be entirely at the cost of the volunteers; there was to be no charge whatever on the rates or taxes.

New clause—

"Whenever a local education authority in any public elementary school, provided or deemed to be provided by them, allows religious instruction of the character permitted under section fourteen of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, such instruction shall be in accordance with the principles of the Christian faith, as set forth in the Apostles' Creed.'"—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

MR. BIRRELL said he was glad of the manner in which the hon. Baronet had approved of the Cowper-Temple clause. He could not help thinking that after these debates were over the Cowper-Temple clause would be the most popular matter involved in the Bill. The proposed new clause was perfectly rational and sensible in itself, and personally he should be glad to see the Apostles' Creed included in all the syllabuses of the country, but he believed that would be taking the wrong course in the part they desired to play. There was no obligation on the local authority to have a syllabus of any kind, and, therefore, they were, so to speak, at the mercy of these authorities in that matter. They could not dictate to them, and he thought it would be unwise to attempt to dictate to them what the syllabus should be. It would be much more wise to leave it to the general sense of the community, and to the feelings of the various religious people in the community. The syllabuses now in use had been the result of friendly communion between the Church of England and various other bodies, including sometimes representatives of the Church of Rome. It was only in that way that they could hope to see satisfactory results. If it were made a statutory obligation to have a syllabus which should include the Apostles' Creed, there might be on certain local bodies persons who did not think every word or expression in that creed desirable or wise to be selected for teaching catechetically in the public elementary schools, and discussions on the points would ensue which he thought it would be better to avoid. Therefore, he could not agree to the Second Reading of the clause.

Question put and negatived.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) moved a new clause to empower the local education authority to appoint two managers and the minor local authority to appoint four managers for a public elementary school. He said that under the Bill, if it passed, all schools would be provided schools, and the appointment of managers would be subject to the law which governed such appointments at the present time—that was to say, four would be appointed by the county council and two by the minor local authority. He proposed to reverse those proportions. He thought the four members should be elected by the minor authority and the two by the county council, because that would help to awaken interest in educational questions. Personally he was sceptical in regard to the statement made by many speakers that less interest than formerly was taken in education; but if that interest had lessened, he thought it would revive if the majority of the school managers were appointed from the parents living in the locality. The noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone had given notice of a new clause specifically giving the appointment of managers to parents. He sympathised with that, but thought there were serious objections from an administrative point of view to setting up a special register for the special election, and that it would be possible to ascertain near enough what the desire of the parents was if they took the electorate of the village, and allowed the parish council to appoint the managers. Those men would, for all practical purposes, represent the feelings of the parents of the children. He did not propose to touch on Clause 15; the new clause which he was proposing did not necessarily touch on that devolution scheme. He thought it was better that the managers should be appointed by the minor local authorities. His proposal that the county council should appoint two representatives would be a valuable provision. It would help to introduce variety. If in any locality there was a predominance of one Party and Party feeling ran high, suitable persons for the work might be omitted from membership, and that the county council would be able to rectify that through the power of appointing two members.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury), in seconding the Motion, said it was the desire of all Members of the House to promote an interest in education throughout the rural villages and in every town in England as much as possible. If the managers were elected by the parish councils a great deal would be done to stimulate that interest. It would be admitted that the parish council knew more about the people in a village than the county council, and that they would be likely to know the men who could serve usefully as managers of schools. He asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education to give the House some information as to the duties which would devolve on school managers in future. In the discussions which had taken place on the Bill very little information in regard to that matter had been given.

New clause :—

"All public elementary schools shall, when the local education authority are the council of a county, have a body of managers, consisting of a body of managers not exceeding two, appointed by that council, together with a number not exceeding four, appointed by the minor local authority."—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.) said that, so far as he understood it, the object of this clause was to strengthen the opinion of the locality against that of the county council; but he believed that the object which the noble Lord had in view would not be secured by the adoption of his Amendment. It would be found that under the provisions of Clause 14 of the Act of 1902 in regard to managers, the rules and conditions under which their duties were discharged were completely under the control of the local authority. Therefore, no mere change of the number of managers which the major authority or the minor authority could appoint would alter the basis of the duties of the managers. Seeing that the Government had dealt so liberally in regard to the appointment of managers and the unsatisfactory character of the change proposed it would be quite impossible to accept the proposal of the noble Lord.

LORD BALCARRES said he was very glad to hear the hon. Gentleman state that there would be practically no change in the *status* of the managers in the non-provided schools.

Question put, and negatived.

VISCOUNT MORPETH said that the point raised by his next proposed new clause was not very important, but it was of some interest. He had been asked to propose the clause by the County Councils' Association. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education would see that this was no Party question. The object was clear, viz., to help regular attendance. As the Bill stood if a child resided more than three miles beyond the area of a school there were no means to compel its attendance even when carriages were provided to convey it to that school. He moved the Second Reading of the new clause he had put upon the Paper.

LORD BALCARRES seconded.

New clause :—

"When a local education authority provides means of conveyance for a child between its home and a public elementary school, it shall not be a reasonable excuse for the purposes of Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, that there is no public elementary school open which such child can attend within three miles of its residence.—(*Viscount Morpeth.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time.'

MR. LOUGH said he agreed with the noble Lord that this was not a Party question. As the law now stood there must be a school within three miles of where a child resided before compulsory attendance could be enforced. Although conveyances had been resorted to by some local authorities, the practice was not so general as to justify the universal application of compulsory attendance beyond the three miles limit.

VISCOUNT MORPETH pointed out that it was only when a conveyance was provided by the county council that the clause would apply.

MR. LOUGH said he quite understood the permissive character of the proposal, but it was much too great a change in the system which had existed for thirty years for him to accept the clause at this stage.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he wished to join in the appeal to the hon. Gentleman to accept this new clause. The experiment had been tried by some of the more progressive county councils and the practice ought to be encouraged. If a conveyance was sent to carry the children to the nearest school it would give no excuse to parents for not sending their children to school. The advantages of a conveyance in widely scattered villages and areas were obvious, and weather and distance ought not to be availed of as excuses by parents for the non-attendance of their children at school. It was advisable in the interests of the children and of education to remove the power which the parents now had of excusing the attendance of their children at a school beyond a three mile limit.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said that from his own experience he believed that the provision would be most useful in rural districts when cross country roads were impassable on account of being flooded in bad weather and the alternative route brought a school outside the three mile boundary. He knew cases where these conveyances had been extremely useful. They might give an opportunity of combining schools, and would also be an advantage in providing the children with a more efficent teaching at a larger school beyond three miles from their homes. He therefore joined with his hon. friend the Member for Leicester in urging the Government to re-consider their decision.

MR. HICKS BEACH said that he likewise supported the clause, and he asked the Government to meet them, at least in this respect, by considering the desirability of inserting such a clause when the Bill reached another place. It was the object of most education authorities to improve one particular school in a central area; and the clause would have the effect of bringing children from neighbouring parishes to the central school. Of course they knew that farmers had great difficulty in getting children at times for labour in the fields unless there were schools in the parish, and, therefore, they objected to the children being taken out of the parish to a central school. But, on the other hand, he believed that the clause would tend to economy and efficiency, because with a conveyance to collect children for the central school, smaller schools would be unnecessary, and the county council would be able to save money by not being compelled to build new small schools.

MR. LOUGH said he did not want to appear negligent to the arguments urged by hon. Members on both sides of the House, but he would point out that there were difficulties about the clause. For instance, there was no limit as to distance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said it was only by leave of the House that the hon. Gentleman could speak again.

MR. LOUGH said he only wished to state that without making any promise he would mention the appeal to his right hon. friend.

Question, put, and negatived.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) moved a new clause providing for an appeal to the Board of Education against the proposal of a local authority to discontinue a voluntary school. The hon. Member said that when the House was in Committee upon this Bill there was considerable discussion upon as to what would happen if a school was not taken over by the local authority, because under Clause 2 of the Bill the local authorities need only take over one of these schools when they desired to do so. Supposing a local authority was hostile to the voluntary school in its district and did not want to take it over what could be done? The local authority need not do anything at all. They need not even give notice to the owners of the voluntary school that they did not intend to take it over. Therefore his clause provided that, "Where a local education authority propose to discontinue any existing voluntary school they shall give public notice of their intention to discontinue such school, and the managers of such school or any ten ratepayers in the area served by such school may, within three months after the notice is given, appeal to the Board of Education on the ground that the said school is required and is better suited to meet the wants of the district than any other school proposed to be provided by the local education authority." During the discussion of this subject in Committee the late Secretary to the Board of Education moved an Amendment making it compulsory on the local education authority that they should continue these voluntary schools. Unfortunately that Amendment was negatived, and then the President of the Board of Education said he would bring forward an Amendment to meet the point. That Amendment came before the House last Wednesday. It was proposed by the President of the Board of Education and yet, notwithstanding the fact that he proposed it, he himself voted against it and put on the Government tellers to whip up votes against it. He with other hon. Members objected to that Amendment upon several grounds. They were shortly these. In the first place it gave a bilateral appeal and two conditions were imposed before the local education authority could be required to take over a voluntary school. The managers must show that the school was required for public school accommodation and that the schoolhouse was suitable and that there were no other grounds for the refusal of the local authority to take the school over. These grounds were very wide and loose, and they on that side thought that the Amendment proposed did not sufficiently meet their views. Another thing was that the arrangement was only to be made for five years; they thought that was far too short a period; indeed they considered that the period ought not to be limited. On several occasions they had had assurances from right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House that they had no intention of doing injustice to the voluntary schools, and that they meant to take them over if the managers desired that they should do so. The President of the Board of Education and the Chancellor of the Duchy used language at the time of the Second Reading of the Bill which, if any words in the English language were clear, indicated that it was the intention of the Government at that time to make these facilities not illusory but real. Unfortunately, however, there were as he had said cases in which local authorities were hostile to the voluntary schools. He had in his mind the case of the West Riding of Yorkshire where they all knew a very great injustice was being done to teachers at the present moment. There was an appeal pending in the Law Courts upon the matter in order to compel the payment to the teachers of that proportional part of their salaries which was due to them in regard to religious instruction. There was also a case in the West Riding where the local authority objected to continue a school as a public school on the ground that they themselves were going to erect a new school to accommodate 720 scholars. These were the sort of cases which they sought to provide against and to set up some machinery by which the managers of voluntary schools should be enabled to appeal to the Board of Education against any injustice of that kind. They had been twitted by hon. Members opposite who said that they were inconsistent in wanting these schools to be taken over. But there was nothing inconsistent in the matter. When the Bill was passed, naturally they wanted the schools to be taken over and not to be left high and dry as they certainly otherwise would be. If they were not so taken over they would cease to be schools. He wished to make, although he did not know whether it was too late, one final appeal on behalf of a large number of schools in this country which up to 1870 and since that year had carried on religious education and had educated half of the children of the country, which was more than the board schools had done. In 1870, when the Act was passed, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Forster said it was not meant to be hostile to the voluntary schools. They said that their object was to complete the voluntary school system. In 1870 there were 14,082 voluntary schools, and there were now 19,883, an increase of nearly 6,000. These additional schools had been built on the strength of the assurances of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Forster that the object of the Act of 1870 was not to supplant, but to supplement, the voluntary system. Was it quite fair now to leave it to the discretion of a local authority to say whether or not a voluntary school should be continued? He begged to move.

*Mr. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) seconded the Motion. It was, he said, becoming increasingly evident that there were many in the House who had a very strong feeling hostile to the voluntary schools and who were determined, if there was any pretext whatever, to prevent their being taken over. There was no desire that schools which were educationally unfit should be taken over. But when they were starting this new Act, which was a great revolution in our educational system, it was desirable that there should be as little friction as possible, and that they should attempt to inspire confidence in the minds of those who would have to carry out delicate negotiations with the local authorities. Earlier in their debates they had hopes that the Minister for Education was with them. It was true that these hopes had been shattered, but he did not think it was too late to ask the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider the matter. If the schools were not to be taken over let the refusal leave behind it as little bitterness and sense of injustice as possible. Let it be done as the deliberate and judicial act of the Board of Education; let it not be thought that it was merely a capricious or vindictive act on the part of any unreasonable local authority.

New clause:—

"Where the local education authority propose to discontinue any existing voluntary school they shall give public notice of their intention to discontinue such school, and the managers of such school or any ten ratepayers in the area served by such school may, within three months after the notice is given, appeal to the Board of Education on the ground that the said school is required and is better suited to meet the wants of the district than any other school proposed to be provided by the local education authority."—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

Mr. BIRRELL said the Amendment went back on a former controversy and proposed a one-sided obligation. As everybody knew, they proposed to come to some arrangement in regard to this matter, and he had brought forward an Amendment which, however, he could not force upon the House. If they could not come to an arrangement on the terms he had proposed, what was the possibility of their doing business on the terms now suggested? This proposal as it stood threw the obligation the other way, and in effect provided that the local education authority might be commanded by the Board of Education to take over any particular school. He thought that the proposed control would interfere too largely with the fair rights of the local education authorities of the country. Although there might be some difference between the Government and hon. Members opposite as to the position of the local education authority, it was not sufficient to justify the strictures which had been passed on his hon. friends behind him. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to have no faith in their statesmanship, and his hon. friends behind him no faith in their Nonconformity. The Government assumed that the education authority would be composed of conscientious gentlemen whose only desire was to do their duty and carry out the wishes of those who elected them. It would be eminently unfair to impose this heavy duty on the Board of Education. What gave him more uneasiness than anything else as the Bill proceeded from clause to clause, was the overwhelming work they were placing on the central Department. If, as had been predicted, the Department was going to be broken down under the weight of the Bill this might be the last straw that would break the camel's back. It would be the difficult and delicate duty of imposing on the local authority the obligation to take over a school that it did not want. He could not accept the clause.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that as the debate continued one was more and more impressed by the fact that this was not so much an Education as a religious disabilities Bill. What they asked for in this clause was an appeal to the Board of Education. That appeal did not mean that the Board of Education should necessarily decide against the local education authority. The Board of Education would no doubt immediately enter into consultation with the local education authority and have before it, explicitly stated, the reason which operated in the mind of the local education authority when coming to its decision. The right hon. Gentleman had given the House the impression that the Board of Education would only be acting for the trustees and managers of the voluntary schools and the parents, whereas it would be acting for the local education authority as well. If they were going to throw complete responsibility upon the local education authority, they made it the real centre of part of the work of the Board of Education. After all, the work of the Board of Education should be to attempt to co-ordinate the system of education for the whole country. It could not possibly delegate, no matter what the labour thrown upon it might be, the natural function of its office, which was to establish a system of education which would have one persuasive spirit; which would have within its capacity the concern of the education of the country as a whole. The Minister of Education said "Oh, no." Because the Board of Education might bend and possibly break under the strain of the responsibility upon it he would shut out the appeal which should be natural and which was inherent in its very existence. He thought the Minister for Education had not been logical in his reply. What they felt was that the tendency of local education authorities in certain districts might be to act inimically towards the voluntary schools and in so doing to act inimically to the education of the area. Local education authorities were not for all time; they were elected to-day and dispersed to-morrow. In many respects they would be purely political organisations in some parts of the country. He was quite aware that the right hon. Gentleman had no desire that they should be, but the passing of this Bill would result in local education authorities using it as a political machine for abolishing the voluntary schools which had in their curriculum religious teaching of which the local education authority disapproved. That ought not to be. When one looked back at the history of the voluntary schools, and saw the part they had played in the education of the country in 1870 there were 8,000 voluntary schools and now there were 14,000—it must be evident that the spirit and wishes of the people had been largely in favour of the system which for seventy years had been deeply imbued with the religious character and moral perception of these schools. He felt very strongly that the Government by refusing to grant this appeal were doing themselves and the principles they had so long held a grave injustice. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was doing himself justice. It was not necessary that the Minister for Education should do this injustice in order to get his Bill through. The serried ranks behind him would see that he did that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Gentleman is speaking a great deal more about the Bill than the new clause.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that this clause struck at the root of the voluntary system as a whole. It showed that the object of the Government was not to encourage in the least but to depreciate the rights of the voluntary system. And because of that the right hon. Gentleman had applied to the general operation of the Bill what was to take away from the voluntary schools the position they had hitherto held in our educational system. He made no appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, because he knew it would meet with no response, but he was privileged to re-state whenever he had an opportunity his views and his objections to a Bill which would have a tendency to reduce for many years the usefulness and the power of the voluntary schools. If this clause were passed it would at any rate give, in the minds of those interested in the voluntary system, a sense of security. If justice was to be done by the present Bill then the least that could be done by the right hon. Gentleman was that he should be just to one cause of which he himself was a profound supporter—the cause of education in this country. When he excluded from the appeal to the Board of Education the adjudication, after due evidence, on the position of the voluntary school in one area which might or might not be oppressed, but which believed it was oppressed, the right hon. Gentleman was not doing his best either for the cause of education or for the party which based its own interest in education on the Board Schools. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had said this afternoon, "Hands off the Board Schools." They had no desire nor had they any legislative intention of removing the Board Schools. But if it were a question of hands off, why not a little bit hands off the voluntary schools? Let hon. Members opposite remember that though they were secure in their majority this Bill would not operate to the best interests of education, being as it was a religious disabilities Bill. When it came to an appeal, as it must, to the religious differences that existed in this country it would be found that those who supported voluntary schools represented a tremendous power which, if challenged, would work not for the solidarity of the Government's postion in the Parliament of this country, but for its ultimate disintegration.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON agreed with the Minister for Education that this clause revived controversies. He was afraid that the conditions under which the Committee stage of this Bill had been conducted made it inevitable that the Report stage should revive former controversies, and that the Opposition should avail themselves of every opportunity of raising a question in which they thought that the justice of their case was so strongly shown. No doubt this clause revived questions which were discussed and laid aside for the moment under a misunderstanding regarding an offer made by the right hon. Gentleman some weeks ago. The right hon. Gentleman had appealed to them almost plaintively about the work which was being cast upon the Board of Education. He admitted the work was tremendous, but if the Department was overloaded, who was responsible but the Minister for Education himself? The right hon. Gentleman had rushed into this great question without giving himself time to master the surroundings and the details, and therefore the Government had come to this, that their remedy in all cases was 'when in doubt appeal to the Board of Education.' The unfortunate Board of Education had to decide questions innumerable both in quantity and in variety. In regard to the present question they fell back upon an assurance given at the commencement of these discussions. It was not a definite pledge, but they all understood that where the voluntary schools desired to retain their religious instruction facilities would be given, and that those facilities would be compulsory. That promise was absolutely nugatory if it were left to a local education authority to refuse to accept any of the voluntary schools, and to sweep the denominational system of teaching out of the whole range of its area. That was apparent very early in the debate. He then moved an Amendment which was most unfairly attacked on the ground that it would compel the local authority to take over a school that was structurally unsound or sanitarily deficient. He never desired to do anything of the sort; he thought that the House might have given him credit for taking care that such would not be the result of his Amendment, but he willingly accepted the Amendment suggested as an alternative by the hon. Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool that where a voluntary school desired to be taken over and was in course of being rejected by the local education authority, an appeal should lie to the Board of Education. The Minister for Education thought there was a good deal of force in it, and the next day an Amendment was put down. The terms of that Amendment disappointed him because he had hoped that they would have got what they asked for, namely, the simple right of appeal to the Board of Education as to whether a school was or was not structurally sound and efficient, and desired by the inhabitants of the area. They got nothing of the sort. The Minister for Education produced a clause in which, as in every other Government concession throughout these debates, something was given, and, at the same time, a great deal more was taken away. The school might claim to be taken over, but, on the other hand, the local authority might claim the school whether it was held under an education trust or not. That was a very great hardship. Although a bilateral arrangement from a terminological point of view had an appearance of equity, as the matter worked out it would produce great injustice on owners who had supplied buildings for a number of years at their own expense, and who might have them rejected by the local education authority if that authority did not want them, but claimed by them if they did want them. Therefore the Government's new clause was not satisfactory to those who desired justice to be done to the voluntary schools. The right hon. Gentleman in moving his new clause presented it in such an elaborately unamiable light to the Opposition that they not unnaturally expressed no enthusiasm for it, and he seized the earliest opportunity of saying that under those circumstances he should vote against it and advise his friends to do so too.

MR. BIRRELL said he would not have been at all sorry to have seen a bilateral clause passed, but he thought it contained provisions which, having regard to promises made, they could not enforce without a general assent.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he not only regretted that the right hon. Gentleman's clause was unsatisfactory on the face of it; but that it became less and less satisfactory afterwards. The right hon. Gentleman now asked them what risk would be incurred. Could not they trust the local education authority? Were they to suppose that all local education authorities were inspired by a passion for Nonconformity, and an animosity towards voluntary schools? He did not think all were, but some were, and in those few cases they had to take precautions and guard against risks. But there were other reasons besides animosity. There was economy. It was quite possible that the local education authority might find it more economical to reduce the number of schools, to work them together, and thus might simply set aside all voluntary schools in an area. One of the objects of the Act of 1902 was to secure that where there was a decided feeling in favour of a voluntary school of a certain type or of a council school there should be an opening to those interested to establish such schools whether or not they were actually wanted for the purposes of school accommodation in the area. Clauses 8 and 9 of the Act of 1902 were drawn to that end, and carried out with that purpose, and he had in his experience many cases in which there was a question between the wishes of the local education authority to have a council school and exclude the voluntary school, and the wishes of the parents on the other hand that the voluntary school should be established giving the religious teaching they required. Under those circumstances it was essential that they should regard, first of all, the wishes of the parents as to the religious teaching their children should receive; and whether or not questions of economy came in, the paramount question was what the parents wanted for the religious teaching of their children. That was the object for which those clauses in the Act of 1902 were passed, and that object would be frustrated by this Bill. The local authority would now have in its power the complete effacement of every type of religious instruction except Cowper-Temple teaching, or what he would call municipal Christianity, or the form of Christianity which commended itself to the municipality for the time being. The President of the Board of Education said this was an undenominational Bill. What did that mean? Was it fair to all denominations? It was a Bill which, wherever it was possible, inflicted some hardship upon the Church of England. What made this Bill all the more unjust was that the members of the Church of England had gone on for thirty-five years building voluntary schools upon the strength of what amounted to a Parliamentary guarantee that those schools should have fair play when the educational system was overhauled. The Act of 1870 was a deliberate encouragement gladly accepted by the advocates of the voluntary system to increase the number of voluntary schools. The amount which had been expended in his own diocese on voluntary schools since 1902 on repairs, improvements, and new buildings amounted to something very large, and between 1903, when the Act came into operation, and last Easter that amount was little less than £60,000. This was all expenditure incurred at the instance of the Board of Education and the local authority. Was it fair that it should be open to the local authority, it might be from religious animosity, or from economy, or from mere caprice, to sweep those schools out of existence and to say that in that area Cowper-Temple religious teaching should be the only religious teaching available to the children? That was a great injustice. It was not only a grave injustice, it was in fact practically a breach of Parliamentary faith. It would leave behind it bitterness, and this Bill would be nothing approaching a settlement of the religious question. If he saw in this Bill any prospect of a settlement he would be the first to help the right hon. Gentleman to get rid of a difficulty which hampered the progress of education at every turn; but he saw no such prospect, and he greatly feared that a few years hence all these questions and discussions would be revived simply because hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial side refused to realise that other people had religious convictions as well as themselves. The only way to effect a permanent settlement of this question was to endeavour to appreciate each other's religious difficulties. By this Amendment they were only asking for an appeal to the Board of Education to decide whether a voluntary school was or was not desired by the population of the area in which it existed.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) said the President of the Board of Education had always acknowledged that there was a gap between Clauses 1 and 2 as they now stood. There was nothing in the Bill at present which would compel any local authority to take over a voluntary school. From the very first time when this was pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman he had acknowledged, with the fairness which had characterised him during the discussion of all questions connected with this Bill, that there was a gap which ought to be filled in. Moreover, he promised that he would himself bring in a clause to fill up that gap, and render it obligatory under certain conditions that a local authority should take over any voluntary schools which were structurally fit for the purpose of public elementary education. The right hon. Gentleman brought forward a bilateral arrangement and the whole of the Opposition voted for it, but, strange to say, the right hon. Gentleman himself voted against it. That was a proceeding of a very extraordinary character. In consequence of the Amendment not having been carried the gap still existed and no way had been found of filling it up. It seemed to him that the proposal now before them was a means at any rate of having an appeal to the Board of Education in the event of the local authority refusing to take over any voluntary school. That would give time for consideration, and the Board of Education would be able to decide whether the voluntary school was or was not necessary, or was of such a character as ought to be taken over. He could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman refused to accept this as an additional clause. They had often been told that they ought to trust the education authority and that they might be certain that the local education authority was not likely to do anything unfair, and would always act in the interests of the children and their parents. Why did the House refuse to trust the local education authority in the clause which his noble friend the Member for East Marylebone introduced? The clause suggested that, notwithstanding anything in Section 14, religious instruction might include instruction in the tenets of a particular religion. The proposal of his noble friend was not mandatory, but it left the local authority to determine whether special facilities should be afforded, and he could not see any reason for not trusting the local authority in such a matter. Why should there not be in this case an appeal to the Board of Education? As the Bill stood, a great many hardships would be inflicted upon the owners and trustees of voluntary schools. He was not one of those who objected to pay for religious instruction in which he did not believe. He was only too anxious to see religious instruction made a part of the national system of education, and he was willing therefore to pay for such instruction even if it did not happen to be the religion which he held himself. At the same time he was anxious that every facility should be afforded for instruction at our elementary schools in the religious principles which he entertained, and also that the same facilities should be given to all other denominations. It seemed to him that the clause which was now before them would very well carry out the object of affording some means of ensuring that a local education authority should be obliged to take over a voluntary school which was in every way fitted for the purposes of public elementary education.

*MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) hoped the President of the Board of Education would accept the very moderate proposal contained in this Amendment. It was a very reasonable thing that those private owners who had in the past had the control and direction of those schools should have a right of appeal to the Board of Education. He was not referring to schools which were inefficient or deficient either in structure or in other respects. He could not expect that school buildings which were insanitary, and which the owners did not propose to put into a proper condition, should be continued in connection with the education system of the country, but there were a large number of voluntary schools, either privately owned or belonging to trustees, which were efficient in every sense, and were an absolute credit to those who had maintained them. It was proposed under this Bill to allow the local education authority to disregard these schools, and that, he held, would constitute an absolute injustice and a lasting grievance. The Minister for Education always spoke as though the local authorities were reasonable. He knew a local authority with a very large number of children in its schools who would not allow a word of religious instruction to be given in the schools, and to such an authority the right hon. Gentleman proposed to hand over the voluntary schools in that great borough. That local authority was pledged against giving any religious instruction in its schools, and it could not consistently with its own conscientious attitude on the subject allow such instruction to be given in the voluntary schools. Parents would suffer an intolerable grievance under this undesirable Bill if these schools were stamped out by the local authority, and they were compelled to send their children to the schools of the local authority. No attempt had been made by the right hon. Gentleman to put that matter right. He began this session with the feeling that they could place some reliance on the Minister for Education, but he had absolutely ceased to do so. He did not trust the right hon. Gentleman's pledges, as he did not fulfil them. The right hon. Gentleman gave a definite pledge that the owners of private schools should have the right to carry out structural and other alterations and charge the cost on the local authority. Where was that provision?

MR. BIRRELL: On the Paper.

*MR. CARLILE said if that were so he apologised to the right hon. Gentleman so far as that was concerned. He naturally felt strongly on this question of the dependence of the voluntary schools on the good will of the local authorities, some of whom had an intenser hatred against the Church than was entertained by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. The whole Bill was inspired by envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness towards the Church of England. High Church and Low Church *e.g.* (represented by the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone and himself) were united against this—to put it mildly—iniquitous and unjust Bill. It was not a Party question. High Churchmen and Low Churchmen recognised that the Bill was inspired by hatred against the national Church.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member must apply himself to the new clause.

*MR. CARLILE said there were a large number of local authorities who absolutely refused to have the Bible inside their schools. They would treat the voluntary schools in the same way and make it impossible to give any religious instruction in them. He asked the Minister for Education to allow this new clause to be embodied in the Bill. The owners of these voluntary schools should have the right of placing their case on appeal before the right hon. Gentleman at the Board of Education. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman's labours were very heavy; he hoped that they would not be long continued. Right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite declined to see the attitude of churchmen on this subject. They asked for protection against the outrage of having their schools, even when efficient, discontinued, or of new schools being forced upon them in which they had no guarantee that the religion which they prized would be taught to their children. The hon. Member for North Camberwell showed his animus against the Church when he cried, "Keep your hands off the board schools." He retorted by saying, "Place not your devastating hands on our schools, backed as those hands are by the paltry and cowardly power that lies in the battalions on the Ministerial Benches." He and his friends believed that these schools were entitled to be continued as an integral part of the educational system of the country. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had shown the bitter hatred of the Church which underlay his argument. He was sorry the hon. Member was not now present, as he would then have put the matter stronger. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would accept this very moderate Amendment. The country was going to ask for a good deal more. Anyhow they were going out into the country, after the passing of this Bill, either with or without this Amendment, under a sense of deep injustice and wrong. He would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that it was not safe to allow a large party in the community to lie under a sense of wrong. They had realised that on the Opposition side of the House very thoroughly. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had told them that in 1902 he had realised it; but right hon. and hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches had, through this Bill and specially through this clause, seriously outraged the consciences of the members of the National Church of the country. He had not unfrequently noticed that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches laughed when any reference was made to the conscience of other than their own small and particular sects. He thought it was very well that members of the Anglican Communion should be allowed to have the privilege or the luxury of a conscience. It was only right that it should be laid clearly before the right hon. Gentleman that whatever form this clause ultimately took—whether amended or left unamended — there would be a sense of conscientious suffering in this country, especially in connection with the National Church of England, the members of which would rise up in their hundreds of thousands until the opposition to their claims had been wiped out and the whole matter put straight.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 138; Noes, 261. (Division List No. 245.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Hon. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E

Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Ox'fd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'wr Hamlets S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W.)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, D. (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herb. John
Glover, Thomas

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.

Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns J. H.

Shaw, Chas. Edward (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said that the object of the clause which he now moved was to transfer the education work of the London County Council to a body directly elected. He did not want to restore the old London School Board, because that was elected on a particular vote. His proposal was that the new body should be elected by the same franchise as that on which the London County Council was elected and that women should be eligible for election. It seemed to him that it would be difficult to estimate the loss which London education had sustained through women not being able to take their share in it. The arguments in favour of the proposal which he made seemed to him to be irresistible. The education work of London was so large that it could not be properly performed by any other body than one which was directly elected for the purpose of carrying it out. No other education body in the country had more than a fraction of the education work which the London County Council were called upon to perform. The House would recollect that there were close upon 1,000,000 children and over 20,000 teachers. The education work of London was at least double the whole of the education work in Wales and nearly equivalent to the whole of the education work of Scotland. Therefore it was obvious that this was the education work not of a county but of a kingdom. It was impossible that the work could be done by a body like the County Council which was overburdened—he would not, however, say overburdened —but which was very heavily burdened with municipal duties. It must be remembered also that they were from time to time putting fresh duties of a municipal character upon the London County Council, and also that large numbers of the members of the London County Council were withdrawn to serve upon other bodies. During the present session a Committee of this House had recommended that the London County Council should undertake the vast work of supplying electrical power to London. He submitted, therefore, that it was absolutely impossible for the London County Council to adequately discharge the important duties which arose in connections with education in the Metropolis. The result of putting this task upon the London County Council had been what one might naturally expect, namely, that the whole of the education work of London had got into the hands of a centralised officialism. They had heard in the course of these debates that even in the case of the provincial county councils officialism largely prevailed, and officials had obtained undue control, but whatever might be the case as regarded the country, and he was not in a position to endorse the views which had been put forward by those who knew the state of things in the country, he did say that the officialism which existed in the London County Council in regard to education was of a grossly accentuated and aggravated kind as compared with that which prevailed among county councils at large. No doubt there were some of the duties of the London County Council which might be successfully performed by officials, but education was not one of them. It was essential there should be personal touch between the local body responsible and those who managed the schools and also that there should be close touch with the parents and the children. Under the old school board system there was close touch between the London School Board and the teachers and the children, but that happy condition of things had disappeared. The managers of the schools had the greatest possible difficulty in getting the simplest matter in connection with the schools attended to; consequently the schools were greatly overcrowded and the classes were excessively large. Under these circumstances it was not surprising that public opinion in London was strongly in favour of the proposal which he now submitted. He had been associated with public life in London for more than twenty or twenty-five years, and he had never known a case in which opinion had been so strongly in favour of any particular course as it was in regard to the absolute necessity, if London education was not to be ruined, of transfering this important work from the London County Council to a directly elected body. He begged to move.

DR. MACNAMARA said that as the first London Member who made a protest against the abolition of the London School Board he had the greatest possible pleasure in seconding this Motion. He had nothing to say against the London County Council, but Providence had limited their capacity. They might not think so, but it was a fact. One of the Members of that body, Mr. Sidney Webb, had said that they did not seek this work but that it was thrust upon them. Therefore, in seconding the Motion, he did not come into opposition with one of their most distinguished members. He was not opposed to the municipalisation of education. The case of London was peculiar. It concerned 25,000 State-school teachers, at least 1,000,000 of students, and a public expenditure of £4,000,000 a year. The finance alone was as large a concern as the finance of all the rest of the County Council's operations. The education work was equal to that of the whole of Scotland, though the latter was divided among 928 school boards. The destruction of the London School Board had been a disastrous leap in the dark; and since then the work of education had become hopelessly bureaucratised. It was conducted behind closed doors, and was in the hands of a powerful body of officials, because the members had not time to attend to it. The purely official charges had gone up from £124,000 in 1904 to £300,000 in the present year. An important higher education sub-committee sat the other day to make certain important appointments. Only one member of the council was present. That was not democratic government, though it might suit the intellectuals. In some cases two or three members sat with six, seven, eight, nine or ten officials, and the appointment committee to which he had referred consisted of but one single member of the London County Council—Mr. Sidney Webb—and it thus came about that several most important offices were filled up by one man. He would also call attention to the fact that Canon Jephson, a most distinguished dignitary of the Church of England, having gone on the education committee of the London County Council, and given it a fair trial, had deliberately stated that he felt bound to resign, because he found himself out of touch with the way in which business was carried on. In the interest of London education this work must be taken from the London County Council or the members of the County Council must be increased. They had quite enough to do before, yet their work was doubled, but not a single member added to their body. Two years ago they ordered a survey of the voluntary schools of London, and anybody looking at the report of the survey would see that the statements made with regard to the drains of some of the voluntary schools were of a very serious character. What was the result? So overburdened was the Council that it was not until Tuesday last that they were able to take the matter up, and even now it was in abeyance and the children were still attending unsanitary schools. There was the same thing with regard to the school attendance problem. Never at any period, not even under the moderate rule of the esteemed Mr. Diggle, had school accommodation fallen so low. So it was with regard to providing teachers for schools. All sorts of shortcomings arose and the work could not be conducted properly. The President of the Board of Education received a deputation recently from the London Liberal Federation which had passed a resolution, with only sixteen dissentients, in favour of an *ad hoc* authority for London. The Metropolitan Radical Association also, with a single dissentient, agreed that the working of this system had so broken down that they must ask for an *ad hoc* authority for London. The President of the Board of Education, when he received that deputation said—and he repeated it on Wednesday night—that he thought the time would come shortly when a directly elected council for the education of London would be requested, and he had no doubt that when that request was made the Government would be prepared to do something by which it would be obtained; that directly this board was asked for the Government would be found ready to meet the wishes of the London County Council. He had the greatest pleasure possible in seconding the Amendment.

New clause:—

"On and after the appointed day, the property, powers, rights, and liabilities of the London County Council in relation to education and of the education committee of the London County Council shall be transferred to a new body, to be called the Education Board for London.

"The Education Board for London shall be a body corporate, and shall consist of one member for each electoral division of the administrative county of London (with the exception of the city of London, which shall return two members), elected on the same franchise and for the same period as county councillors, and women shall be eligible for election.

"The first election of the Education Board for London shall take place at the same time as the election of the London County Council in the year one thousand nine hundred and seven, unless the Board of Education shall appoint some other day for such election.

"The 'appointed day' shall be the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and seven, or such other day, earlier or later, but after the election of the Education Board for London, as the Board of Education may appoint."—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

MR. BIRRELL said that two such consummate Parliamentarians as his hon. friends who had moved and seconded the Motion would quite understand how impossible at this stage of the Report and under closure it was for him to accept such a clause, which would destroy the London County Council as an education authority. That was quite out of the question, and therefore he hoped that no remarks made would have so wounded the *amour propre* of his hon. friends as to induce them to reply. It was desirable to get on with Amendments, of which there were many to be disposed of after the new clauses were got rid of. He had always said that it was his belief that the task imposed on the London County Council to superintend the teaching of 750,000 or 800,000 children was a task beyond their power. Sooner or later this would be recognised and then the Council would ask the assistance of Parliament to enable a transfer to other shoulders of this vast problem. When that time came he felt satisfied that no Government would refuse to consider that claim, but it was not possible now.

*SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) said he quite agreed that it was not necessary at this stage to debate this question. It was only fair, however, to the London County Council to say that the statements and charges made against the Council during this discussion and on many previous occasions in the House as to the way it had carried out its duties with regard to Education had no foundation in fact. Those who knew what was being done, and what had been done for education in London were rather tired of hearing it said over and over again by the hon. Member for North Camberwell that the education of London had got into the hands of officials; that the London County Council had failed in the task imposed upon them. Those statements had no foundation in fact. There might be and no doubt were many reasons for the education of London being carried on by a separate authority, but neither of those charges mentioned was one of them. He denied the allegations of the hon. Member for North Camberwell that the London County Council were unable to bear the burden cast on them by the Act of 1902. As to the suggestion that Mr. Sidney Webb sat alone in committee carrying on the work of the Council, it was, of course, absurd. There were rules and standing orders governing the proceedings of the London County Council like all other public bodies, and unless there were a proper quorum present as required under those standing orders, neither Mr. Sidney Webb nor anyone else could act alone in committee. The figures showed that there were no less than 5,585 attendances in one year which had been devoted to education by the London County Council and that 738 committees had sat, which gave an average of seven members for every committee. Those who desired a separate education authority for London should advocate it honestly and not attack the London County Council in this way, and not say the London County Council were not able to bear the burden cast upon them. It might be the opinion of some that the work of the London County Council lay in other municipal directions, but if it was in the opinion of this House desirable that they should be responsible for the education of London they were quite able to undertake it. The London County Council, in spite of what the hon. Member for North Camberwell had said, had dealt with the non-provided schools in an exemplary manner. It had satisfied London and the Board of Education, and had not given offence to the non-provided school owners. When the hon. Member referred to the survey, he might tell the House that it was only now that the County Council was putting on pressure. Those non-provided school owners who meant to carry on their schools would, he had no doubt, put their schools in order during the coming recess, and the Board of Education would be the first to come down on those who did not. The attacks which had been made on the London County Council were absolutely unfounded. There was a driving power behind those who wanted to discredit the London County Council. The President of the Board of Education had been lending a willing ear on this and on other occasions to people who attacked the London County Council. It was somebody's duty to stand up and tell the House that these attacks upon the Council were perfectly unjustifiable. He did not say there might not be arguments for taking away education from the London County Council, but they were not the arguments which hon. Gentlemen behind him were ready to urge. Let them urge some other reason, but let them not say that the London County Council had failed in that respect. He was as anxious as his hon friend the Member for S.W. Bethnal Green that women should be engaged in the work of education, and the County Council had brought women into that work. It was one of those duties for which they were fitted, but in order to get their assistance it was not necessary to have an *ad hoc* authority. Let them be on the County Council; he strongly advocated that. The hon. Member for North Camberwell said they were the only committee that had not admitted the Press to its meetings, but the London County Council had never delegated their powers as an education authority to a committee. In the Report of the Select Committee of this House on the question of underfed school children, the chairman of the education committee of the London County Council was described as the chairman of the London education authority. It was the London County Council who was the local education authority, and it had never delegated its power. Whatever might be the reasons for hon. Members urging the setting up of a separate authority for education in London he was prepared to prove that their case, so far as it was based upon the failure of the London County Council to carry out the work, was absolutely unjustified. The Council had never asked for this work to be put on it, but having been entrusted with those duties it had carried them out. If the House desired to leave the County Council in charge of education it could do so with confidence, and with the full knowledge that the work would be done thoroughly and well.

MR. BIRRELL said that as no earthly good could come out of this discussion and the Government could not accept the clause, he hoped they might be allowed to come to a decision on it without further loss of time.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said he had great sympathy with the Amendment. He was not sure that he agreed with all the arguments of the hon. mover, but he certainly agreed that the administration of education by the London County Council had not been so successful as that of the London School Board. He spoke very frankly on this subject, because he was one who thought it would be a good thing to transfer education from the school board to the County Council. He did not know the County Council then as he did now, and he had changed his views. One would think from the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down that the County Council entered upon these duties with the whole-hearted intention of administering the Act of 1902 to the best of their ability. The remarks of a distinguished member of the County Council at that time would show that that was not the case. The hon. Member for North St. Pancras in 1903 said that the County Council had had placed upon it against its wishes the administration of the Education Act, and that he did not conceal from himself that the administration of that Act furnished the gravest possible danger the Progressive Party had ever had to pass through, but that so far as they were responsible for the administration of the Act, they did not intend that it should break up the Progressive Party. It was perfectly clear that the Act had not broken up that Party, but he did contend that the way they had administered the Act of 1903 had broken up education in London. Nobody who had had experience of the two bodies could have failed to discover the enormous increase of officialism under the present system as compared with the old school board. The hon. Member for North-East Bethnal Green had quoted the large number of attendances of the education committee, but it did not in the least follow that they were therefore carrying on education in London well. What he would have liked to have heard the hon. Member quote was the number of times they had been to see the schools for which they were responsible. He heard complaints all round, and he believed they were justified, that there was not that sympathetic touch between the members of the education committee and the schools which existed between the members of the school board and the schools. One of the greatest mistakes that the London County Council had committed was that they had not delegated enough of their powers to the education committee. The hon. Member for North-East Bethnal Green had spoken of that as if it were a feather in their cap. He had also referred with indignation to the fact that the chairman of the education committee had been called the chairman of the local education authority. He only wished the gentleman in question had been in that independent position, because he would have been able to do a great deal more education work for London. Another very serious objection to the manner in which education in London was administered was the exclusion of the Press from the education debates. He had no complaint against the education committee, but he complained of the way in which their work had been hampered by the Council.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL: They are the education authority.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said they did not do their work properly because they did not delegate enough of their powers to the education committee. Therefore he had great sympathy with the Amendment, and thought it dealt with a matter which required the serious attention of the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

MR. PICKERSGILL asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Question put, and negatived.

*MR. SPEAKER said the remaining clauses on the Paper were out of order.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, to leave out the word 'may,' and to insert the words 'appear to.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the word 'may' stand part of the clause" put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 27, to leave out 'by the authority.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the words 'by the authority' stand part of the clause,'" put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 27, after the word 'authority,' to insert the words 'subject to the right of the owner of a schoolhouse which is not held under any charitable trust himself to carry out, if he wishes it, any alterations or improvements so required, and to recover from the local education authority any expenses which, in the opinion of the authority, or in case of dispute, in the opinion of the Board of Education, are reasonably incurred for the purpose.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question "That those words be there inserted" put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question, "That further proceedings on consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Birrell*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

RUTHERGLEN BURGH ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [BY ORDER].

Read the third time, and passed.

DEANERY OF MANCHESTER BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) in moving to omit the clause, said that if the information he had received was correct, before provision was made for ornate services in the Church the money rendered available should be applied for stipends to the clergy who were needed to minister to the suffering poor of Manchester. It was a sorry fact that not one of the Members for Manchester—all of whom were Radicals—had risen to explain, criticise, or support the Bill. Their indifference was another proof that they and the Government were treating the Church in Manchester in the same brutal irreligious way that they were treating the Church in the country under the Education Bill.

Lord TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Are we to have no Answer to the hon. Member for Hoxton?

Mr. CLAUDE HAY submitted that he was entitled to some reply from a Member of the Government. He did not expect the Prime Minister, after his labours to-day, to be in his place, but someone amongst the array of Ministers sitting on the front Ministerial Bench ought to know something about this Bill.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) stated that, on the Second Reading, the Prime Minister entered into all the details of the Bill. If hon. Members would provide themselves with copies of the Bill they would find all the details set out in a memorandum which was twice if not three times as long as the Bill itself. This Bill was not desired by the Government. It was introduced at the request of the Dean and Chapter of Manchester.

Lord TURNOUR, remarking upon the want of explanation of the Bill and upon the absence of the Law Officers of the Crown, moved to report progress.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again."

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) suggested that, as hon. Members opposite did not want the Bill and the Government did not desire it, it should be dropped and the Deanery of Manchester left to look after itself.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY said the Bill was necessary before the new Dean of Manchester could be installed.

Question put,

The Committee divided: Ayes, 49; Noes, 307 (Division List No. 246.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn Hugh O.
Beach, Hn Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Magnus, Sir Philip
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Starkey, John R.
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Claude Hay and Viscount Turnour.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.

Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (Tw'r Hamlets, St. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hon. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Fergusson, R. C. Munro
French, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza-
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'str.)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'hampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.

Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, J. (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southamptn
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J.D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W.T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Clauses agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment. Read a third time and passed.

———

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Bill as amended by the Standing Committee considered.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.) moved a new clause requiring that architects, surveyors, engineers, or clerks of works, for the purposes of the Labourers Acts, should have sufficient knowledge for such employment. He said the object of the clause was to enable district councils to obtain qualified architects and others. It was believed that this would be of advantage to the district councils who had to put the Act in force, and that it would enable them to save money. He did not desire to press the Amendment strongly, but he thought it his duty to lay it before them.

New clause—

"Every person whom a district council propose to employ as architect, engineer, surveyor, or clerk of works for the purposes of the Labourers Acts shall satisfy the Local Government Board that he has sufficient knowledge and experience for such employment."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that personally he did not like the clause, and did not know why the Chief Secretary proposed it; but rather than occupy time he was willing to accept it if the right hon. Gentleman was satisfied that it would be of advantage to the district councils. He recognised that, unless they got the Bill through the Committee stage, and also got the Third Reading to-night, it would be impossible to get it through the House of Lords before the adjournment of the House for the holidays. It would be a misfortune to hang up the matter until the autumn session.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid) said that personally he liked the clause, and on behalf of the labourers he welcomed it.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said that he also, on behalf of the labourers, welcomed the clause. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stand by it. The Leader of the Nationalist Party appeared, to think the clause unimportant. It might seem at first glance that it would add to the cost of buildings, but he believed it would have the very opposite effect.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) moved a new clause to provide that there should be no limitation of the size of parcels of land allotted to agricultural labourers if the land was acquired by agreements. He said this clause raised an important question. Hitherto the scope of the Labourers Acts had been confined wholly to the house and a holding not exceeding an acre in extent. By Section 2 of the Land Act of 1903 labourers had been enabled to obtain small holdings. The clause now proposed raised the question whether a labourer or a labourer's son might get a small holding of land which would enable him to live in the country. A great many labourers had had to leave Ireland in the past to find employment in Great Britain, America, or elsewhere. He was glad to think that the importance of the question of small holdings was beginning to be realised in this country. If it was important here it was far more sc in Ireland where there were fewer manufactures and industries. If the labourers were to be retained in the country they must get employment on land of their own by being provided with small holdings. It would be impossible for every labourer in the country to get a small holding; but as many as possible should be enabled to do so. This clause would come properly as a subsection of Clause 5 which enabled a district council to obtain land by agreement. He had given notice of another new clause to extend the powers of district councils to acquire land which might be purchased by labourers where no land was available in connection with the sale of an estate under Section 2 of the Land Act of 1903. It was important that labourers should obtain small holdings. Under the Act of 1903 labourers could only obtain small holdings where an estate was for sale; but he wanted an extension of the powers and he hoped the Government would accept his Amendment in some shape or form in order to provide all agricultural labourers with these small holdings.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) seconded.

New clause—

"No limitation as to the area of the parcel of land which may be allotted to an agricultural labourer as defined by the Labourers Acts shall apply in the case of land acquired by a district council by agreement subject to the approval of the Local Government Board."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said he was opposed to the Amendment because he thought it was directly opposed to all the existing Labourers Acts. The object of those Acts was to provide sanitary and suitable cottages with gardens surrounding them for the agricultural labourers instead of their present turf and mud cottages. The Amendment, however, proposed to turn the labourers into small farmers on uneconomic holdings. He insisted that they would be travelling outside the scope of the Labourers Acts if they proceeded to raise the *status* of the labourers into that of farmers. If that was desired it ought to be carried out by means of a new Land Bill. Another point was that if the labourer got more land than would provide him and his family with the necessaries of life, it would become more and more difficult for the surrounding farmers to get a supply of labourers in harvest and at other critical times in working a large holding.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said that the Government could not accept the Amendment. The financial resolution had already been passed, and to extend the scope of the Bill would increase the amount of the Exchequer grant to a large and uncertain extent, and would also increase the interest on the amount of money to be borrowed.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. O'SHEE said that his next Amendment referred to the Labour Commissioner being empowered to exercise the powers of the Local Government Board. He pointed out that in the past the labourers had been unable to approach the Local Government Board except by writing a letter. The usual course adopted was to refer that letter to the district council, with the result that the labourers got very little satisfaction in regard to their complaints. He wanted some individual to be made responsible for this Department. As a matter of fact, he believed there was such an officer but that he was unknown to the labourers. The Government ought not to object to the Amendment, because it did not propose to appoint any new officer or to create a new salary.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN seconded the Amendment. He thought the object to be attained by the Bill would be altogether unattainable unless there was a special officer with special experience set apart to exercise the powers of the Local Government Board. The present inspectors were a very mixed crowd. A number of them were obstructionists to any labourers scheme, and others had had no experience in the matter at all. There was no one especially responsible for carrying out the Labourers Acts, and so their operation dragged on. What was wanted was the appointment of a Commissioner who would cut through all sorts of red tape; and this demand had always been made by the labourers' organisations themselves. He was quite convinced that unless a special Department with special responsibility were created to see that the details of the Act were carried out there would be discontent and a feeling of injustice in the minds of the labourers of Ireland.

New clause—

"The powers and duties of the Local Government Board shall be exercised by an officer of the Board who shall be described as the Labour Commissioner."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. BRYCE sympathised with the desire of the hon. Member who had just sat down for extension in regard to the administration of this Act, and he thought it would be very convenient that the work to be done under the Bill should be concentrated in one Department. This, however, was not at present compatible with Departmental arrangements. The hon. Member who moved the clause did not wish to have a separate Department, and he thought that his object would be secured by his having pressed upon the Irish Office the necessity of concentration. As soon as the Department was started they would consider the matter. He must not be taken as giving a positive pledge. He thought, however, the Amendment was inconsistent with the scope of the Bill, but he would consult with the hon. Members who moved and seconded the clause and would consider the matter with every desire to see that the Bill was properly carried out. He hoped under the circumstances the Amendment would not be pressed.

Mr. J. REDMOND said he took it that the right hon. Gentleman wished them to understand that this Amendment was not necessary to enable him to constitute a new department of the Land Commission for this work, and that when he had had more experience he would consider whether that could not be done. Although they should prefer to have the matter settled there and then, still he hoped that under the circumstances the Amendment would not be pressed.

Mr. O'SHEE said he was satisfied with the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that he would look into the matter, and therefore he would withdraw his new clause.

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. FLYNN moved to insert a clause imposing a limit of time of one month for executing schemes. He argued that cheapness and expedition of procedure were necessary, and therefore he moved this proposition.

New clause:—

"In section 8 of the Act of 1891 which limits the time within which the sanitary authority shall take steps for carrying an improvement scheme into execution 'one month' shall be substituted for 'three months.'"—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this clause be read a second time."

MR. BRYCE said they were all in favour of carrying out the Bill with expedition, but he did not think it desirable to put in this clause, because it might be impossible to carry out a scheme in a fixed period. He thought it was more a matter to be dealt with by rules, and they proposed at the end of the Bill to take power for the Local Government Board to make rules which would deal with all matters of this kind. He thought a proposal of that kind would have the advantage of elasticity and would enable any mistake to be rectified by a subsequent rule. That he thought would be better than a fixed term.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.) moved a new clause in regard to the aplication of the Act to improvement schemes originated, but pending.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.) seconded, and trusted that the hon. Gentleman would see that it was a matter of justice to district councils that these schemes should be brought within the provisions of the Act.

New Clause—

"This Act shall apply so far as possible in accordance with the rules and adaptations to be made under the Act to all improvement schemes originated but not completed before the date when this Act comes into operation."—(*Mr. Kendal O'Brien.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. BRYCE said he did not see that there need be any difficulty with regard to money in regard to schemes originated but not completed before the date when the Act came into operation, because any scheme which came into effect would do so under the new money arrangements, and there was every desire on the part of the Treasury to make the new benefits available as largely as possible to any new scheme. He believed that where any scheme had not gone to the length of assent having been given to the report and the completion of the inquiry it would be conducted under the procedure of this Bill. Where it had gone further there would be a provision as to appeal; therefore the Act would not deprive people of the right of appeal, and he did not think the proposed new clause was needed.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.) moved a new clause, giving labourers who are the tenants of rural district councils a right to turbary. The hon. Member said he represented every labourer in West Clare, and he had a perfect knowledge of their requirements. Many of these men only earned 1s. 6d in two days, and this Amendment would be of great importance to them. They worked in neighbourhoods where there was plenty of turf and if the right hon. Gentleman assented to this proposal he would have done one of the most important Acts to assist the labourers in his district and other districts.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) seconded the Amendment, and expressed the hope that the Chief Secretary would give his closest attention to this matter of turbary, which most closely affected the people in many districts. He affirmed that the labourers were entitled to exercise the right of turbary.

New Clause—

"An agricultural labourer who is tenant to a district council of a cottage and plot or of an allotment under the Labourers' Acts shall be deemed for purposes of turbary to be an occupier of land on the estate of which the plot or allotment formed part prior to its acquisition by the district council."—*Mr. Halpin.*

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. BRYCE said that the desire of the agricultural labourers of Ireland to be furnished with fuel was one with which the Government quite sympathised, and which they recognised was urgent. He had no hesitation in accepting the proposed new clause.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause read a second time and added to the Bill.

MR. LUNDON moved a new clause for providing for the Amendment of the 48 and 49 Vic., c. 77. He said he would be content with merely moving his proposed new clause.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) seconded, and was proceeding to argue in favour of the proposed new clause when——

MR. BRYCE interrupted, and said he would be glad to save time by stating at once that he accepted the clause.

New clause—

"The second proviso in Section sixteen of the Act of 1885 shall be and the same is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Lundon.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time," put, and agreed to.

The clause was read a second time and added to the Bill.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN said this was one of the most important clauses that could be incorporated in the Bill. Under the Labourers Acts at present no labourer's cottage could be built except beside a public road. A public road in Ireland was a road formerly maintained by the Grand Jury and now by the county council. There were, all over Ireland, roads not maintained by the county council which led, in many instances, to great farms over which the public had practically a right of way, and they had the absurd spectacle of sites being fixed and cottages erected on small farms while farms of far greater extent were, on this account, allowed to go scot free. He thought, in common justice, that what was accessible to the farmers should also be accessible to the labourers. He would give two or three examples from his own locality, but a similar state of things obtains all over Ireland. The whole electoral division of Kilmore in the Cashel Union was so situated that it did not touch a public road anywhere. A river ran from end to end on one side of it. It was formerly the property of the Earl of Normanton, but was purchased by the tenants eighteen or nineteeen years ago. It contained about 2,000 acres and on account of this absurd rule not a single cottage could be built on all that land. One farmer, a Mr. Thompson, held 300 acres, and because two roads, a couple of hundred yards in length, abutting on the public roads at each side of his farm were private roads, he was exempt. In the electoral division of Emly, Tipperary Union, one of these roads, called boreens in Ireland, led to seventeen farms which were also exempt. In the electoral division of Ballygriffin, also in Tipperary Union, there were four farms averaging 600 acres accessible by one of these roads, on which no cottage could be built, though there was in the same division a cottage on a nineteen acre farm because it happened to touch a public road. He knew personally that many of these farmers holding large farms strongly desired to have cottages erected upon them and would gladly give constant employment to the labourers occupying the cottages; therefore, he strongly urged, in view of the further successful working of the Act, that this clause should be inserted in the Bill. Otherwise it could never give complete satisfaction.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.) seconded the Amendment, which he said was necessary, if even-handed justice was to be dealt out all round. It was only reasonable that farms which were now exempt because they were a little remote from public roads, should be made to bear cottages on the land equally with those which adjoined the public roads.

New clause to be added—

"The words 'public road' in Section three of the Act of 1886 shall be deemed to include any road or passage over which a public or private right of way exists."—(*Mr. Kendal O'Brien.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said the Government were able to accept the principle of the Amendment. They appreciated what had been said. Every one acquainted with Ireland knew there were lanes existing which were suitable for the erection of labourers cottages in. The Government were prepared to accept the principle of the Amendment in the following form—

"Notwithstanding anything in Section three of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1886, the lands for the purposes of this scheme may be selected if they immediately adjoin or are accessible from a road or lane over which a public or private right of way exists."

CAPTAIN CRAIG pointed out that the Amendment suggested by the right hon. and learned Gentleman would enable a cottage to be built in a lane which was really only a footway.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said he thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman had hardly appreciated the effect of his suggested Amendment. If there was a right of way suitable for carts as well as people he would have no objection whatever to labourers cottages being placed in the vicinity of that right of way. But, as everybody acquainted with Ireland knew, there were many private rights of way which consisted of a footway which had gates across them in order to prevent cattle straying, and when anybody exercised the right of way here was an obligation to keep the gate s closed when they had passed through them. To have cottages in a right of way of that kind would in many cases amount to an intolerable nuisance to the farmers of the land. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had not considered that when he accepted the clause in the form suggested by himself, because it would include an ordinary footpath from one farmer's field to another, which was only used perhaps when he wanted to go to a place of worship. The Amendment was far too generous. It should be confined to rights of way over which carts and horses passed.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) hoped the Government would not be persuaded by the right hon. Gentleman in this matter. It must be remembered that these restrictions did not exist in the Act of 1883, and were only put in three years later in the Bill of 1886—a Bill which was got through the House with great difficulty. And then it must be remembered that the guardians were men who would wish to stand well with the farmers, and therefore they were hardly likely to select the inconvenient spots suggested by the hon. Gentleman. In the second place, if they did, there was the inspector of the Local Government Board who would not allow it. He thought this was a most important Amendment, and hoped the Government would not be persuaded not to accept it.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) ventured to suggest to the Chief Secretary that the Opposition were not treated quite fairly by the right hon. and learned Gentleman's moving an Amendment of this kind. The hon. and learned Member for North Louth had endeavoured to show that the objections of his hon. friend were not substantial because the case he put would not arise. Then why give the extended terms? Everyone admitted that the restrictions of the present Act were too narrow, and they were quite prepared to accept an Amendment which would limit the erection of cottages to the public highways. But as the right hon. and learned Gentleman, the late Attorney-General, had pointed out, this Amendment would permit the building of cottages not only on public roads but on private footpaths. He thought some consideration ought to be shewn to those who represented the minority, and that a far-reaching Amendment of this kind should not be introduced at this stage without some safeguards. Having regard to the period of the session, and the fact alluded to by the hon. Member for Waterford that this Bill could only pass into law if passed very rapidly through both Houses, the Chief Secretary would admit that it was not fair to introduce a new principle at this stage.

MR. JOHN REDMOND denied that it was a new principle. It had, he said, been on the Paper for days and the Government had accepted it with safeguards. The fears of the right hon. Gentleman were quite groundless, because no schemes could be put into operation except with the approval of the Local Government Board of Ireland. That was surely safeguard enough.

MR. BRYCE said that nothing was further from the wishes of the Government than to create surprise in the House. He was glad to hear the admission of the right hon. Gentleman that there was room for some Amendment of the law, and that there ought to be some places beside the public roadsides available for the erection of labourers cottages. The Amendment of his right hon. and learned friend proposed to limit the clause to the case of a lane. What the Government had done was not to spring something new upon the House, but to take an Amendment which had been down for a long time and safeguard it in the way proposed by his right hon. friend. When they added to that safeguard the fact that the inspector of the Local Government Board would look at the place and know all the circumstances, including the objections which anyone could bring before him, surely there was no risk.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 239; Noes, 27. **(Division List No. 247).**

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastb'rne)
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberd'n)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Som'set, N.)
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. B. (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul

Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A.H.(Ashton underLyne)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Ward,W.Dudley(S'uthampton
Wardle, George J.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, H. J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Starkey, John R.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wortley,Rt. Hn. C.B. (Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Marquess of Hamilton.

MR. CHERRY moved to amend the new clause in the manner he had proposed. Their object in drafting the clause was to provide for the very objection which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had made.

Amendment proposed in the proposed new clause—

"To leave out the words down to the word 'over' in line 2 of the clause in order to insert the following words 'notwithstanding anything in Section 3 of the Labourers Ireland Act,1886, lands for the purpose of this scheme may be selected if they immediately adjoin or are accessible from a road or lane.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that so long as the words stood in the form proposed by the right hon. Gentleman it would be open to a district council to put labourers cottages upon a laneway which was not wide enough even to admit a donkey car, but only wide enough to permit persons passing to and fro on foot. It was said that there was sufficient protection in the fact that the Local Government inspector would not pass anything like that. All he could say was that he had known schemes sanctioned by these inspectors which had resulted in the grossest persecution of individuals, and which had to be put right on appeal to a judicial tribunal. He failed to see why this matter should not be expressed in language which made it plain that Parliament did not sanction the putting up of a labourer's cottage adjoining a laneway not suitable for ordinary vehicular traffic.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said the right hon. Gentleman stated that he had known cases of the grossest persecution resulting from the passing of these schemes.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL: I said they had passed the inspector.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said there was an appeal from the inspector, and how was the right hon. Gentleman to know that cases of the grossest persecution had arisen when they had never been passed at all?

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said what he stated was that the argument that there would be protection in the inspection of the Local Government Board official was refuted by the fact that in the past the Local Government Board officials had, over and over again, sanctioned schemes which had been upset by the Privy Council on account of their unfairness.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that was not what the right hon. Gentleman had said, but was it worth while dwelling on that point? The Amendment of the Government was a most reasonable one, and there was no difficulty whatever in the matter.

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

Mr. HALPIN moved the following clause—

"The inspector appointed by the Local Government Board to hold the inquiry as to the propriety of confirming an improvement scheme, or some other person appointed by the Local Government Board, shall, during such inquiry and in the same place, forthwith proceed to decide on the amount of compensation to which he may consider the claimant to be entitled in each case in manner provided by the second schedule to The Housing of The Working Classes Act, 1890, and make his award as soon as conveniently may be."

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND seconded, and hoped the Chief Secretary would recognise that the clause would greatly facilitate and hasten the working of the Act. He understood that when his hon. friend mentioned the matter in Committee upstairs, the Government consented to consider it favourably.

New clause:—

"The inspector appointed by the Local Government Board to hold the inquiry as to the propriety of confirming an improvement scheme, or some other person appointed by the Local Government Board, shall, during such inquiry and in the same place, forthwith proceed to decide on the amount of compensation to which he may consider the claimant to be entitled in each case in manner provided by the Second Schedule to The Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and make his award as soon as conveniently may be."—(*Mr. Halpin.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. BRYCE said he had promised to consider the subject, but the result at which he had arrived was not favourable to the clause. In the first place, the inspector was not a person who possessed the knowledge necessary for the purpose mentioned in the proposed clause. The other suggestion made by the hon. Member was that the arbitrator should set to work conjointly with the inspector. He desired to consider whether that could be done because it was suggested that it would lead to a shortening and quickening of procedure, but it was apparent that there would be cases in which the inspector would not be able to give his decision immediately. Until it became certain whether there would be an appeal from the inspector's decision it would be no use setting the arbitrator to work, because, if he awarded a price and afterwards it was decided that the plots were not to be taken at all, the costs incurred in arbitration would be thrown away. The Government desired that the proceedings should be taken as quickly as possible and that the arbitration should follow rapidly on the inspection; but he did not think this Amendment would at all give that result.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would at all events remove the present class of arbitrators who were dealing with the Irish Labourers Acts, who were land agents opposed both to the farmers and to the labourers.

MR. JOHN REDMOND hoped the right hon. Gentleman would bear in mind the remarks of his hon. friend who had just sat down. The present issue, however, was whether the inquiry and the arbitration as to the compensation were to be simultaneous. As the right hon. Gentleman thought it was impracticable, perhaps he would see that regulations were made by the Local Government Board that the arbitration should be held immediately after the inquiry by the Local Government Board inspector. The chief object of his hon. friend in moving this new clause was to prevent the additional delay and the additional expense of the two inquiries, but if the two inquiries were necessary it would be some satisfaction if there were regulations insisting on the second inquiry following immediately the conclusion of the first.

MR. BRYCE said they proposed to take powers for the Local Government Board to frame rules, and he would certainly bear in mind the suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

MR. T. M. HEALY suggested that the words "may with the consent of the parties" be inserted in place of "shall."

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said it was quite unnecessary, because if the parties consented they did not want arbitration.

Question put, and negatived.

***MR. SPEAKER** said the proposed clause ("Extension of powers of district councils to acquire land.") standing in the name of the hon. Member for West Waterford was out of order because it proposed to spend money out of public funds.

MR. O'SHEE said the clause only dealt with a case where land was not available in a particular locality under Section 2. Why should the labourers of one district be kept out of the operations of the section altogether?

MR. McKENNA said without disputing the merits of the case put forward by the hon. Gentleman he must point out that he was proposing to make a charge upon the Treasury.

MR. O'SHEE said he was quite prepared to add the words "provided no charge was made on the ratepayers." This proposal was simply to enable district councils to acquire land by agreement. None of the compulsory provisions of the Labourers Acts would apply in this case.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I do not think the clause of the hon. Member is in order. It really goes beyond the scope of this Bill.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) moved a new clause to provide that a rural district council might employ skilled workmen directly at the standard rate of wages prevailing in the district for the erection of labourers cottages. At present it was optional for district councils to have the work on the roads done by contract or by direct labour. It had been proved that the work was done better and cheaper by direct labour. He thought that a better case could be made out for direct labour in connection with the buildings of cottages. In some cases contracts for the erection of cottages were undertaken by farmers in order that they might be able to meet rent charges, and being unable to carry out the work properly the buildings were inferior even to those erected by the worst jerry-builder. This clause would leave it optional to the district council to contract or employ direct labour.

Mr. SHEEHAN in seconding the Motion, said this was a reasonable clause, which would be in the interest both of economy and efficiency.

New clause—

"That, in order to secure economy and efficiency in the administration of the Labourers Acts, a rural district council may make provision for the erection of any or all of the cottages included in an improvement scheme by their engineer or other qualified officer directly employing skilled workmen at the standard rate of wages prevailing in the district."—(*Mr. Crean.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. BRYCE said he saw no objection to this new clause, but it was entirely unnecessary. He believed that some of the district councils were employing their own workmen.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. BRYCE moved to insert in Clause 6 the words—"Including any agricultural labourers by whom or on whose behalf representations have been made." He explained that the object of the Amendment was to meet the case which the hon. Member for Cork County (Mid) wished to provide for in the following Amendment, of which he had given notice—

"The inspector appointed to hold the inquiry as to the propriety of confirming an improvement scheme, shall, on the application of a labourer who has made, or on whose behalf a representation has been made, to the district council, which such council has declined to follow, hear evidence in reference to such representation, and, if satisfied, shall direct such representation to be complied with."

The object which the hon. Member had in view would be better attained by the Amendment he now proposed, and he hope it would be accepted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, after the word 'interested,' to insert the words 'including any agricultural labourers by whom or on whose behalf representations have been made.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. BRYCE moved to leave out from the word "schemes" in line 25, to the end of line 32. The Amendment was intended to get rid of the difficulty which had arisen on Clause 6 of certain limiting words. He had made inquiry at the Local Government Board, and he found that it was quite impossible to make specific provisions with regard to time without the greatest possible inconvenience and risk of the whole thing falling through owing to the time not proving adequate to the case. The Attorney-General for Ireland had given notice of an Amendment which provided that the Local Government Board should make rules with a view to expedition and fixing the period during which the proceedings should take place. He assured the Committee that the Local Government Board would make rules to provide that the work should be done in the shortest possible time.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 25, to leave out from the word 'schemes' to end of line 32."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he regretted that the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to stand by the decision of the Committee. The Amendment standing in the name of the Attorney-General for Ireland went some distance to meet them and to provide that the Local

Government Board should make regulations fixing the period during which the inquiries should be held. In the circumstances he was not prepared to insist on going further.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he assumed it was implied that the charges which were made against the Local Government Board were withdrawn.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Who made the charges?

MR. WALTER LONG: They were made abundantly.

MR. FLAVIN: They were made by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Trinity College.

Question put, and negatived.

Words omitted.

MR. CAMPBELL said the Labourers Acts had been in operation since 1886. The scheme of operation had been this: A representation was made by the district council, and the Local Government Board sent down one of their inspectors, who held a local inquiry. The Local Government Board either accepted or rejected the scheme. If they accepted the scheme it was open to any person aggrieved to lodge an appeal by way of petition to the Privy Council in Dublin. It could not be denied that during the last twenty years scores of schemes which the Local Government Board had sanctioned were the result of deliberate political spite or persecution. ["No."] These were not a few isolated cases. There were scores of such cases. There had been a great many schemes which had been approved not merely by the Local Government Board inspector, but also by the Local Government Board, which when they came to be investigated by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council it was found had been put in force for the purpose of persecuting farmers who were obnoxious to others in the vicinity. A typical case had occurred within the last three weeks. It came before the Lord Chancellor and Justice Holmes. An inspector had approved and the Local Government Board had ratified a scheme by which the district council proposed to place in a holding a labourer who had been the ringleader in remorselessly boycotting a farmer for five years. That was done in direct pursuance of this policy of boycotting.

AN IRISH MEMBER: Was it not the case that the costs were too expensive for the labourers to appear in the courts?

MR. CAMPBELL said that the facts were proved, and the Court of Appeal declared that the main and direct object of the scheme was not the benefit of the labourers but the punishment of the farmers. The right of appeal was entirely swept away under this Bill. He did not complain of the removal of the appeal from the Privy Council to another tribunal, because at present the process was expensive, and witnesses had to be brought from the remotest parts of Ireland to Dublin, where the Court always sat, and counsel had to be employed. He would like to know what the justification was for depriving these farmers of a right to appeal to a judicial tribunal. He asked the House to remember that in all these cases the scheme had already received the sanction of the Local Government Board inspector and of the Local Government Board itself. This Bill proposed to make the Local Government Board the absolute masters of the situation. Was that fair? The members of the Local Government Board were not lawyers and had no judicial training; and it was not even proposed that they should have the parties aggrieved before them to state their case. The only thing proposed was that if anyone objected to a scheme the Local Government Board were to consider it; and unless an objection was taken to the scheme, the finding of the inspector was to be absolute. He maintained that that was a most unjust provision, and that it deprived citizens of the protection of their rights of property—a protection afforded in any other civilised country. He suggested last year, as he did now, that the appeal should go to a Judge of Assize, which would lessen the cost. An appeal to the Local Government Board would be illusory, because it would be an appeal from their own inspector to themselves. The avowed intention of the proposal was that the Local Government Board should be, through the Chief Secretary, subject to an attack in Parliament; but he ventured to suggest that a body which was to be entrusted with the highly responsible judicial task of investigating these appeals should not be exposed to attacks in Parliament. He did not want for a moment to introduce any provision which would unnecessarily delay the operation of the Labourers Act when it became law, but he wanted to introduce considerations of justice and fair play. The Allotments Act in England had never been used for the persecution of individuals; but it had been proved that the Labourers Acts in Ireland had been used in many cases for purposes of persecution. [An Irish Member: Not one per cent.] But if even only one per cent., that one individual should be protected, and the very object of the right of appeal was to protect him. As to the cost of an appeal to a Judge of Assize, the county would not suffer, because the judge would have a power to award the costs of parties according to the ordinary principles of the Courts of Law. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, to insert, at the end, the 'Any person interested who has presented a petition which has not been withdrawn may appeal from the decision of the Local Government Board, confirming the order, to the judge of assize for the county in which it is proposed that house accommodation shall be provided or land taken compulsorily. The judge of assize shall hear the appeal and determine all questions arising thereon, and may either confirm the order with or without amendment or disallow the same, and may award costs to be paid by or to any of the parties to the appeal. Rules of Court regulating the practice, procedure, and costs, applicable to appeal under this section, and prescribing the time within which an appeal may be brought may be made by the authority having power to make rules of Court for the Supreme Court.'"—(*Mr. Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. BRYCE said he hoped the House would allow him to state the views of the Government very shortly. He admitted the very great importance of the question. The right of appeal of course involved very considerable cost, but the dominant motive which weighed with the Government, and which he hoped would weigh with the House, was the question of expedition in the settlement of these questions. They really must have a cheap tribunal, and with that view they had decided to do away with the appeal to the Privy Council. The question of an appeal to a Judge of Assize had also been under consideration, but after long deliberation that proposal was put aside because it would involve great delay, inasmuch as the Judge of Assize would only sit in March and July. That in itself was a very serious objection; but in the next place, it had been the invariable practice when an appeal case was brought before a Judge of Assize, for counsel to be retained at a large cost, and witnesses had also to be brought from a distance. The expenses involved, therefore, would hang round the necks of the labourers as a dead weight, and therefore the Government had come to the decision that the appeal should be only to the Local Government Board. These considerations appeared to them to be decisive. He did not in the least accept the statement of the hon. Gentleman that the machinery of these Acts was habitually used for the purposes of oppression.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he had never used the expression "habitually." He had said it was very often used.

Mr. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman said it was so in scores of cases.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I adhere to that.

Mr. BRYCE thought that was an exaggeration. There was nothing to prevent the Local Government Board from hearing persons and doing justice between them. They would, he was certain, do justice in this matter. The English Local Government Board had acted in a similar manner under the Allotments Act, and no objection had been taken to their action, and he did not see why any objection should be taken to the action of the Local Government Board under the present Act. For himself he thought the proposals of the Bill were better than those of the Amendment.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) thought that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was most unsatisfactory, and that there was an absolute ground for an appeal. On the face of it, as the matter now stood, the Local Government Board would be called upon to act as a Court of Appeal from one of its own officials. What would happen when an appeal was brought up against the decision of one of its inspectors was that he would be asked what he had to say. He would reply that his report was a perfectly fair one, and then the Local Government Board would confirm his report. No one surely would contend for a moment that that was a rehearing of the case. It was true that the Judge of Assize sat three times a year, and although at present he had no power to hear appeals of this kind at the winter assizes, such a power could be given by Order in Council. This would give three occasions in the year, once every four months, in which these appeals could be heard. He did not think that under such a system as that there would be undue delay. The costs would not fall upon the rural district council but on the person bringing the appeal, and he submitted that the fact that the person who brought the appeal was liable for the costs would be a sufficient deterrent against people bringing frivolous appeals. There was no reason why they should follow the precedent set in the Allotments Act, and he maintained that a very strong case had been made in favour of some better and higher appeal than was provided for by the Bill. Unionist Members during the passing of the Bill through Committee and Report stage had done everything in their power to facilitate the passing of the measure. If they could not have the appeal which was proposed, why should there not be one to the county court judge?

*MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.) thought that there should be appeals from the decisions of the Local Government Board. If the decisions of that body had always been right, how was it that in so many cases the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had reversed the decisions of the Local Government Board? In one case the inspector regarded it only as a coincidence that all the cottages of a larger scheme were placed upon the land of those who belonged to one particular religious persuasion. The Local Government Board also regarded it as a mere coincidence, but when the matter was investigated by the Judicial Committee they did not consider it as a coincidence, and they only passed about one half of the scheme for cottages sanctioned by the inspector of the Local Government Board and approved by that Board. He did not say that these schemes were always used as a method of oppression by district councils. There were cases in which they were used properly, but there were other cases in which a man was unfairly treated, and where some appeal should be given. The point which was of importance was not the question of £50 compensation or £60, but the fact that the erection of labourers cottages in a particular part of a demesne, pleasure ground, or farm might be ruinous or very injurious to the owner, and was often attempted for that very reason where the owner was unpopular. He thought that under these circumstances there should be an appeal from the Local Government Board in the review they passed upon the decisions of their own local inspector. He agreed that costs should be kept down, but they were in these cases exceedingly trivial.

MR. WALTER LONG said there was a very strong feeling in regard to this question of appeal in many quarters, and it was unsatisfactory to find that no attempt was made to meet them. The Chief Secretary had admitted their claim to be reasonable, but he did not meet them at all, or say why he could not accept an appeal to a county court judge. The Allotments Act had no bearing upon the case, and no instances had been given in which injustice had been inflicted. For instance, the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Justice Holmes had in one case arrived at the view that the land was taken, not for the purpose of providing for the labourer, but for the purpose of injuring the farmer. He had the greatest respect for the English and Irish Local Government Boards, but he thought there should be an appeal from their decisions when action was taken with a view of injuring a farmer. From his experience of the Labourers' Acts he knew that grave injustice had again and again been perpetrated. In such cases there should be a Court of Appeal. If, on the other hand, injury was perpetrated against individuals the only protection that could be given to them was a proper Court of Appeal. He hoped his hon. friend would press his Amendment to a division.

Mr. CHERRY said he was anxious to get on with the Bill, and he thought everything possible to be said on this Amendment had been said by his right hon. friend. Two proposals had been made. One was that there should be an appeal to the Summer Assizes. That was dealt with, and then it was suggested that appeals might be taken to the Winter Assizes. That would delay the appeals by about nine months. It must be remembered also that the Winter Assizes for the whole of Ulster were held in Belfast, and those for Munster were held in Cork, and that would necessitate people being brought from long distances. The Government had provided very carefully for all considerations. On every complaint made to the Local Government Board the Local Government Board were bound to hear the full report of the inspector and they were bound to receive any letter. The officials were accessible, and if anyone came to Dublin to make complaint and was not seen by the Local Government Board officials, the Chief Secretary would soon hear of it in this House. Having heard all that had been said, if they thought there was anything in the complaint made they were empowered to have a further local inquiry. There was nothing to prevent the matter being carried out fairly and equitably. The only disability which he saw was that complainants could not be heard by counsel. The Government had considered the matter very carefully and they had come to the conclusion that the clause carried out the object they had in view better than it could be carried out by any other form of words.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said they ought not to go to a division on this Amendment without reminding the Tory Party of their own record in this matter. In 1887, when the Tory Party were passing the Coercion Acts, and the Leader of the Opposition was the Chief Secretary, they promised an appeal in every case. In the Louis Beck case they surrendered their position, but since 1887 they had sent hundreds of men to prison without any appeal. Now, on the question of the taking of half an acre of land they wanted an appeal. For what purpose? To prevent the giving of a shelter to the most miserable creature on earth.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 25; Noes, 221. (Division List No. 248.)

AYES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthorpe, G. Lloyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Starkey, John R.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Tellers for the Ayes—Viscount Valentia and Marquess of Hamilton.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)

Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B.(Hexham)
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordsh.)
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Caldwell, James
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard K.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H.(Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Wugh
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford, S.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Symth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, W. Dudley(Southampt'n
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved to leave out Sub-section 9 of Clause 11, which enacted that in determining the amount of compensation payable to any person the arbitrator should not make any additional allowance in respect of the purchase being compulsory. He considered that a most unjust provision. The result of the operation of the Land Purchase Act was to convert tenants into owners, and they would be the persons to get compensation under this clause. Why had the Government thought fit to depart from what had been the universal practice, that where a man was compelled to part with his property he was not merely given the actual market value, but ten per cent. in addition, because he was compelled to part with what he wanted to keep? This was the first time in his experience that it had been departed from. He was afraid the clause was introduced for the purpose of establishing a precedent, and it would be a very dangerous one.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 30, to leave out 'sub-section (9.).'"

Question proposed, "That the sub-section proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BRYCE said the House might have supposed from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman that the Government were proposing to abolish a most venerable law in Ireland. The 10 per cent compensation for compulsory sale had no legal foundation whatever. It was a mere custom which had grown up among surveyors and land valuers through property being taken by railway companies who could afford to pay the 10 per cent. There was no justification for it, and he was glad of an opportunity of referring to the matter. He had no ulterior object in the sub-section. He did not see why a man should be paid more than the true value of the land which was sold to these poor people. There was a very good precedent for his proposal in the Local Government Act of 1894.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 218; Noes, 23. (Division List No. 249.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Fustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W.
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Phillipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, W. Dudley (S'thampton
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Starkey, John R.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon Lionel
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Marquess of Hamilton.

Mr. CAMPBELL proposed to insert at the end of Clause 11 the words "unless the Court shall otherwise order." He contended that the clause as it stood was grossly unjust. He quite agreed that the cost of an application should be kept down as much as possible, and therefore he agreed with the general rule that the cost of getting, say £100, should not exceed £10. But supposing the landlord, in order to make a title to that £100, had actually to undergo an outlay of £30, then he would only get £70 compensation. Was that fair or just? What he suggested was that there should be no rule that in every case a man should not get whatever cost he incurred, but that the Court should have power to increase the cost from £10 wherever it thought just. If this were a Bill affecting property rights in this country there was not a Member of the House who would say that the proposition contained in the Bill was fair and just. But because it affected Irish landlords anything was good enough for them. He warned hon. Members who approached this subject in that spirit that their time might come.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 41, at end, to insert 'unless the Court shall otherwise order.'"—(*Mr. Campbell*).

Question proposed: That those words be there added.

Mr. CHERRY was sorry to say on behalf of the Government that he could not accept this Amendment. The amount paid for compensation under this Bill would not exceed as a general rule more than £50 in all for each plot of land taken. That would generally be divided between two or three persons. It would be very exceptional where the total compensation was more than £40 or £50, and surely in that case £10 was enough for costs. In County Court procedure at present costs were strictly limited, and the County Court had no jurisdiction to increase them. In many cases the amount expended by a party was a great deal more, but they must take the average case.

Question put, and negatived.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 8, line 15, to leave out 'October,' and insert 'March.'"—(*Mr. Bryce*).

"In page 8, line 16, to leave out 'six,' and insert 'seven.'"—(*Mr Bryce*).

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND moved the next Amendment in his name. He had moved it in Committee, but withdrew it on an undertaking by the Secretary to the Treasury and the Chief Secretary that the Government would carefully consider the whole matter between then and the Report stage. The working of the Labourers Acts in Ireland had been retarded owing to the high rate of interest charged for loans, the rate having been as much as 4½ per cent., and amounting with sinking fund in some cases to 6 per cent. or more. The claim they made was that the interest should be reduced so that they should have cheap money, and he should like to take this opportunity in the presence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to acknowledge the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had met them on this point. Personally he had found the Chancellor of the Exchequer most sympathetic in the matter, and he could testify to the fact that so far as the future was concerned, the right hon. Gentleman had conceded their demand practically to the full. He had made an arrangement whereby money would be lent for the purpose of the Labourers Acts on Land Purchase Act terms, namely, 3¼ per cent., including sinking fund, which would enormously facilitate the acquisition of cottages. It was a very rare luxury for him to be able to congratulate the Treasury, although he ought to qualify the statement by saying that the congratulations were more due to the right hon. Gentleman personally, than to the Department. His Amendment was to extend the Land Act terms to past transactions. There were at present outstanding loans amounting to £2,600,000, and if no mitigation were given in the terms in respect to those loans, there would be this ludicrous fact, that those portions of the country which had shirked the Act, would get good terms, whereas those parts which had put the Act into operation would be mulcted. That was a state of things which was not fair. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would find no difficulty in seeing that these loans were oppressive, and that he would be able to hold out some hope of being able to deal with them. He moved the Amendment for the purpose of enabling the right hon. Gentleman to make a statement on the matter. He knew the difficulties that lay in the right hon. Gentleman's path. He understood that if the right hon. Gentleman himself proposed a similar Amendment it would be necessary to recommit the Bill. The recommittal of the Bill would most certainly mean that the measure could not be passed into law during this portion of the session. Possibly the right hon. Gentleman would be able to make a statement which would to some extent satisfy the representatives of Ireland. He might be able to promise next year to deal with the Act of 1897 whereby the hands of the Treasury were tied in the matter of the extension of the time of repayment, and in the matter of interest. If he would give an assurance that he recognised the injustice it would go a long way to meet the view which they entertained. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 37, at end, to add—'(2) Where any moneys borrowed before the passing of this Act for the purposes of the Labourers' Acts are not repaid at the passing of this Act any rural district council by which such moneys are owing may borrow on the like security such amount as may be required for purpose of paying off such moneys in whole or in part. Advances for the purpose of this sub-section may be made by the Irish Land Commission to a rural district council out of the Irish Land Purchase Fund, as if the same were required for the purchase of land by a tenant from a landlord under the said Act, and all such advances shall be repaid by an annuity in the same manner as if the rural district council to whom such an advance is made were a tenant purchasing land under the said Act."—(*Mr. J. Redmond*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said it was as unusual as it was gratifying for the representative of the Treasury in this House to receive any acknowledgment from the Leader of the Irish Party. He was not sure that he should receive it except with a certain amount of trepidation, because some of his friends on this side of the House might think that he had been guilty of an irregularity in the trusteeship which he exercised on behalf of the community at large. He was satisfied that the provisions made in the Bill with regard to future loans were both financially sound and morally equitable, and he did not in the least degree recede from them. He confessed that he had considerable sympathy with the case which the hon. and learned Gentleman put forward, but he could not possibly accept the Amendment under any circumstances for the reasons stated by the Secretary of the Treasury when the Bill was in Committee. In the present state of the money market he could not throw the additional charge on the Irish development finance which this proposal involved in regard to past loans. Nor could he make, as he should otherwise have been glad to do, any substantive proposal of his own for the reason suggested by the hon. and learned Gentleman, namely, that any such proposal must involve recommittal of the Bill, and therefore imperil, if not altogether destroy, the chance of its being carried as they all hoped it would be before the autumn recess. Let him say with regard to the general question, that while he acknowledged to the full the hardship which was imposed on local authorities in regard to past transactions through the high rate of interest they had to pay for these loans, the Government had in the eighteenth clause of the Bill made some substantial provision for dealing with the case. He wished it was in the power of the Treasury to relax the interest on the loans and to extend the duration of the term for their repayment, but in consequence of the statute to which the hon. Member had referred it was impossible for the Treasury to extend the term for the repayment of existing loans without increasing the rate of interest. He was prepared next session to bring in a measure amending the provisions of the Public Works Loans Act in a way which would enable the Treasury in future in regard to these and other loans, and also in regard to local loans generally, to adopt a more elastic procedure, and one more in harmony with the practical necessities of the case. If the hon. Gentleman was ready to accept that assurance he might be content to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. J. REDMOND asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.) moved to leave out Clause 18. He said he had no feeling of hostility to the Bill, and he yielded to no one in his desire to see a thoroughly satisfactory Labourers Act put on the statute-book and put in operation throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. He believed the measure would go a great way towards cheapening and simplifying the procedure which had to be gone through in connection with the provision of labourers cottages, and it was because he believed that it was a reasonable attempt to deal with the housing problem in the rural districts that he desired to see removed from it what he regarded as the one blot on the Bill. It was a matter of extreme regret to him and his colleagues in the representation of Ulster that the Chief Secretary had been so ill-advised as to include in this proposal a clause which they could not help regarding as a blow struck at the people whose interests they represented in this House. Under the apparently innocent guise of a new method of distributing the Exchequer contribution, Clause 18 would rob Ulster of the greater part of its share of that fund which since 1891 had been allocated every year for the building of labourers cottages in Ireland. It was proposed to take this money from Ulster and give it to other parts of Ireland which in many ways had been much more generously treated than Ulster in the distribution of public funds. The Government proposed to disturb the arrangement sanctioned by Parliament in 1891 and continued ever since, and he thought the House ought to have an opportunity of considering both the reasons put forward for this change and the arguments which might be stated in favour of the present method of distributing the fund. The contribution from the Exchequer amounted to £40,000 a year, of which £3,000 was set aside and paid to the principal municipal authorities in Ireland. For the year 1904–5 the residue amounted to about £36,811, and that was divided among the counties of Ireland, "as nearly as may be in the proportion of the shares of the counties in the Irish Probate Duty Grant." Under the scheme of distribution the counties of Ulster received in the year 1904–5 a total of £12,408. The shares of the other provinces in the same year were as follows: Leinster £9,419, Munster £11,066, and Connaught £3,913. The Government now proposed to allocate this fund "in proportion to the number of cottages provided before the commencement of this Act"; and he would invite the House to consider the change that would thus be made in the respective sums credited to the four provinces. Under this scheme the share of Ulster would be cut down from £12,408 to £2,500, representing a loss of £10,000 a year: The share of Leinster on the other hand would be increased from £9,419 to £11,700. Munster also would get a larger share, namely, £15,200 instead of £11,066, while Connaught's share would drop from £3,913 to about £600. Surely, in view of these figures, which he believed to be approximately correct, the House could not be surprised that this clause was very strongly objected to in Ulster. The effect of this withdrawal of £10,000 of public money from the Ulster counties must be to limit the possibilities of the labourers in those counties obtaining the cottages they required. No good reason had yet been shown why the labourers of Ulster should be in this way penalised. Apart from the fact that the majority of them were Unionists—which he hoped was not a crime in the eyes of hon. Members opposite—he knew of no reason whatever why these men should be unfairly treated in the way the Government proposed. Their need was as great as that of the labourers of Leinster or Munster; and he maintained that, as a class, they were deserving of at least equal consideration with those in the other parts of Ireland. The only reason that he had seen advanced for this change was that in some of the counties of Ulster the money hitherto allocated from this fund had remained unused. But he submitted that was a most inadequate reason for withdrawing the money. If it were the fact that in some districts the local authorities had been slow to carry out the duty of providing labourers cottages, it was surely most unjust to punish the labourer. The proposal of the Government was simply to pile disability upon disability so far as the labourers of Ulster were concerned. In effect they said to the Ulster labourers, "Because your local authorities have failed to build you cottages in the past, therefore we shall make it more difficult for you to obtain cottages in the future." Could anything be more unjust or absurd than that? Instead of stimulating the district councils to build more cottages for labourers, this Act, so far as Ulster was concerned, would actually discourage them.

This clause fixed the future distribution of the fund for all time. The new cottages which might be built under the Act would not count in the distribution of the grant. No matter how many cottages might be built in the future in Ulster, the share of the fund allotted to the province would not be increased by a single pound beyond the paltry sum at which it was fixed by this clause. His own county of Armagh would be hit very hard by this proposal. The county had hitherto been credited with about £1,000 a year, but under this new scheme the amount which Armagh would get would be very little more than £100. The labourers of Armagh would therefore be placed in a most unfair position, and it was on their behalf that he ventured to express the hope that the House would not permit this injustice to be done. The omission of this clause would not affect the working of the rest of the Bill in any respect, and he appealed to the Government and to the House to consent to this Motion and thereby remove a just cause of resentment from the minds of the people of Ulster. He begged to move.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that in seconding the Motion of his hon. friend he wished to say that the representatives of Ulster looked upon this clause as the most important in the Bill; and that if it was permitted to remain, the Bill would be of no use to the labourers whom they represented in this House. In his own county of Antrim the Exchequer contribution from 1896 up to the present had been £2,466 per annum. That was under an arrangement which was supposed to be final. It was unfair that that arrangement should now be disturbed. He might say that in other respects the Bill was a most admirable measure; but under its redistribution proposals Antrim would only receive £466, so that the county would lose £2,000 per annum. In other words, they would be deprived of the means of erecting twelve cottages in Antrim. It was said that the reason why this reduction was possible was that in the past, unfortunately, the Labourers Acts had not been put in force. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: We all know that.] He would not restrict his speech because of those unseemly interruptions. He had to admit that the reason why the Labourers Acts had not been put in operation in Antrim and the adjoining counties could not be laid on the shoulders of the labourers but upon the shoulders of the rural district councils, which according to the hon. Member below the gangway, contained all the intelligence of Ireland. [Ironical NATIONALIST cheers and laughter.] He should have very shortly to ask the Deputy-Chairman to use his influence to stop these interruptions.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER advised the hon. Member to take no notice of them.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that the point he had raised seemed to him to be the crux of the whole Bill. By this clause the Chief Secretary was going to take away the very considerable advantages which, by law, belonged to Ulster. He maintained that it was unjust to place on the shoulders of the labourers the faults of the rural district councils, and that it was to a large extent due to the action of the political Home Rulers that the Labourers Acts had not been properly administered. The necessity for improved labourers cottages was as keenly felt in Ulster as in any other part of Ireland; and they were entitled to better treatment than they had received in the past. He contended, however, that Clause 18 would be practically an injury to Ulster and he would rather not have the Bill at all if this clause was retained in it. What he suggested was that there should be a periodical redistribution of the Exchequer grant. He begged to second the Motion for the rejection of the clause.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 13, to leave out Clause 18."—(*Mr. Lonsdale.*)

Question proposed, "That Clause 18 stand part of the Bill."

MR. BRYCE said he was not surprised that hon. Members from Ulster wished to leave out this clause, but in his opinion it was necessary. In 1891 a large sum of money was allotted to different counties in Ireland, but it was intended that this amount, some £37,000 a year, should be spent in supplying labourers cottages all over the land. Certain counties in Ireland had spent money, and there was in consequence a very heavy charge upon the rates, but other counties had not spent the money and therefore there was little, if any, charge upon the rates. The Government thought that this was a travesty of the intentions of the Act of 1891, and by this section they proposed that having regard to all the cottages which had heretofore been built the money should be divided among the district councils in proportion to the cottages they had built. Those district councils who had built the most cottages would get the most relief, which was believed to be the intention of the Act of 1891. They thought this was a fair adjustment. Hon. Members spoke as if this was an attack upon the northern counties, but that was not so, as every district council would occupy the same relative position.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said that Members from Ulster had cordially welcomed this Bill on the Second Reading as they believed it would provide relief to a long suffering class. Clause 18, however, which they hoped would have been omitted, not only destroyed that hope, but placed them back under the present Act in the position they were before the introduction of the Bill. In county Down they had a grant of £2,026, which under this Bill would be reduced to £325, towards the building of labourers cottages. These were striking figures, and this Bill made their last state worse than their first. The clause thus made the Bill a sham Bill and one of spoliation and robbery. He must admit that in the Committee upstairs the hon. Member for South Tyrone had the courage to stand up and say that this clause would tell against the people of Ulster. The clause was a real injustice against his constituency.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said it was quite true that in the Committee upstairs he voted with the hon. Member and he intended to vote with him again. He did not, however, believe that the Bill would be of no use or that it meant spoliation or robbery. Even if Clause 18 stood the labourers would have the benefit of a grant of cheap money. The rural district councils of Ulster, consisting of farmers, it was true, had resolutely refused to build cottages out of the rates, and the result was that the amount receivable under the Acts had accumulated. It was because the district councils had refused to carry out the law and to supply cottages for the labourers that this action of the Government had been taken, and it was because he denied the fairness of punishing the labourers for the act of the district councils that he objected to the proceedings which it was now proposed to take. That was his objection in Committee and it was his objection now.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said it appeared that they were to have the hon. Member for South Tyrone and the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh in the same lobby, and he asked whether it was not the fact that the last named hon. Member had built cottages and had made covenants in regard to them that they should not be occupied by Papists.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) said it was only fair that some relief should be given to those district councils who had pledged their rates to the extent of a 1s. in the £ for this purpose as against those who had done nothing. The district council of South Antrim taxed themselves to the extent of 2d. What these gentlemen wanted was to have cottages built at other people's expense.

Mr. LONSDALE: In answer to the hon. Member for North Louth, I may say there is not a word of truth in the statement that I built cottages in Mid. Armagh.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Will the hon. Member say that in the cottages he has built there is not such a clause as I have stated.

MR. LONSDALE: Certainly not.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I say there is.

***MR. SPEAKER**: This does not seem to me to be relevant.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for North Louth has given my hon. friend the lie direct.

***MR. SPEAKER**: It does not seem to me to be relevant.

MR. LONSDALE: May I not be allowed to ask the hon. Member to withdraw his charge after I have stated that it is not true.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What the hon. Member has done is to provide that his cottages shall only be occupied by Conservatives.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that the same thing?

MR. T. M. HEALY: In Mid Armagh it is.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) said he had not before intervened in this debate, but there were one or two statements that had been made from which he must dissociate himself. The hon. Member for South Antrim had rightly stated that the district councils were to blame for not taking advantage of the Labourers Act and that for that the labourers were not to blame, but he went on to say that if Clause 18 were passed in its present form the Bill would be practically useless and he would rather not see it passed. That was where he (Mr. Sloan) drew the line. He quite agreed that Clause 18 was unjust to Ulster, and against it he entered his protest. But in his opinion it was a great pity that this Bill should be made a political and religious question. It ought not to be. It was and ought to be a question of the benefit of the labourer in Ireland, and while he disagreed with Clause 18 he should certainly regret to see the Bill destroyed or even mutilated against the interest of those who might not agree with him politically and religiously. He hoped, although, with his hon. friends, he would register his protest in the division lobby against Clause 18, the Cheif Secretary would be as willing to try and meet the representations of Ulster as he had been to try and meet the representations of other districts of Ireland.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 250.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan. J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor (Southampt'n
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, W Dudley (Southampton
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. T. L. Corbett.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 25, at end, to add the words 'or by a son of any such labourer.'"—(*Mr. William O'Brien.*)

MR. BRYCE said the Government had no objection to the Amendment, but they considered it is not a convenient part of the clause in which to insert it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 30, to leave out the word 'advances,' and to insert the words 'an advance.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question, "That the word 'advances' stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

MR. O'SHEE moved an Amendment the object of which, he said, was to enable any agricultural labourer whatever his position to acquire a piece of land. The clause originally proposed to give a privileged position to a labourer who had already got a labourer's cottage. The present suggestion of the Chief Secretary, however, proposed, not merely to deprive him of his privileged position, but to put him in a position of inferiority. His Amendment was simply to put all labourers on an equality in regard to obtaining a parcel of land.

MR. FLAVIN seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 32, to leave out from the word 'who' to end of clause, and to insert the words 'resides on or in the neighbourhood of the estate.'"—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. CHERRY said the Government could not accept the Amendment in the form in which it had been moved. The Amendment standing in his name immediately afterwards would practically carry out the object of the hon. Gentleman.

*MR. O'SHEE asked leave to withdraw his Amendment on the understanding that he would move to omit the proviso at the end of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment, which excluded labourers in the possession of cottages under the Labourers Act.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 10, line 33, to leave out from the word 'advance' to end of clause, and to insert the words 'resided on the estate or in the neighbourhood thereof. Provided that any pre-existing tenancy under the Labourers Acts of the applicant for the advance shall be determined before the advance is made.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN moved to add after "thereof" in line 2 of the Amendment the words "or by a son of any such labourer."

MR. CHERRY accepted the Amendment to the Amendment, and said he would explain the object of the proposal. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Agreed."]

LORD TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said the House was in a somewhat extraordinary position. The Attorney-General for Ireland rose to explain his own Amendment but was shouted down by his own side.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

MR. O'SHEE moved to omit all the words of the Amendment after "thereof" in line 2. He said the proviso would cause a good deal of friction, because it would mean the absolute exclusion, unless they surrendered their cottage of all those persons who had cottages from getting a parcel of land when there was land available in the neighbourhood.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out from the word 'thereof,' to the end of the proposed Amendment."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Words, as amended, inserted in the Bill.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 6, at end, to add 'and the registration shall be made free from all rights and equities referred to in Sub-section 3 of Section 29 of that Act. (2) Where any land, the ownership of which is registered, is conveyed to a district council for the purposes of the Labourers' Acts the registration shall be made free from the said rights and equities.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 19, to leave out the words 'in connection with,' and to insert the word 'under.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 22, leave out 'under the said Acts.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 29, after '1903,' insert 'as amended by this Act.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 30, leave out from 'labourers' to end of clause."—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH moved an Amendment providing that the amount of the fees, etc., should be fixed by the Lord Chancellor, the Vice-President of the Local Government Board in conjunction with the President of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 12, line 33, to leave out from the word 'Acts,' to the end of the sub-section, and insert the words 'the Lord Chancellor, the Vice-President of the Local Government Board, and the President of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland for the time being, or a member of the council of that society to be nominated by the said council, may make rules fixing the amount of fees and providing for the taxation and payment of any costs to be received, allowed, or paid in relation to the confirmation of improvement schemes under the Labourers Acts."—(*Mr. Fetherstonhaugh.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. CHERRY said this was an Amendment which ought to be on the Notice Paper involving as it did a complete alteration in the scheme of the Bill.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH said it was on the Paper in Committee.

MR. CHERRY said the hon. Gentleman was not in the Committee to move it, but it was fully discussed and almost universally rejected by the Committee.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 12, line 34, to leave out the first 'may.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 34, after the word 'things,' to insert the words 'may, for the purpose of securing expedition, fix the periods within which inquiries shall be held and improvement schemes dealt with and may.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

"In page 12, line 36, after the word 'confirmation,' to insert the words 'and carrying into execution.'"—(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. T. L. CORBETT moved to add in line 24 of Clause 29 the words, "For the purposes of this Act the term 'labourer' includes fishermen who are employed in sailing vessels or steam trawlers, and artisans who are exclusively employed by farmers or at work on farms." He said there was a large number of men employed in sailing vessels and steam trawlers who were part fishermen and part labourers, and who were working for very low wages and were entitled to protection under this Bill. Then there was a large number of artisans who did a great amount of occasional work on farms and were entitled to the advantage of the provisions of this Bill.

Another Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 13, line 24, at the end, to insert the words, 'For the purposes of this Act the term 'labourer' will include—(1) Fishermen, whether employed in sailing vessels or in steam trawlers; (2) Artisans who are exclusively employed by farmers or on work on farms."—(*Mr. T. L. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. JOHN REDMOND hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said that, after considering the Amendment carefully, the Government had come to the conclusion that the definition of "labourer" that already existed in the Acts was sufficiently large, and that it was not desirable to increase its scope at present. These Acts were passed for the benefit of agricultural labourers and not fishermen, but if a fisherman did any agricultural work he was entitled to come under the definition.

MR. SLOAN: Does the definition include the man who does occasional agricultural work?

MR. BRYCE said the definition which was drawn from two sets of Acts meant a person who did agricultural work for hire at any season of the year on the land of some other person and included hand-loom weavers and fishermen doing agricultural work.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said this Bill was to confer a boon upon a considerable number of people who were described as Irish labourers, and at the close of the Bill the House was told that if certain people such as fishermen were engaged for any portion of the year in agricultural work they would be able to obtain the benefits of the Act. It therefore followed that if a fisherman dug a potato he was to come under the Act. If the Act was to be fair and was to do any real good to the people it ought to be as wide as possible in its application. It seemed to be very invidious that special benefits should be conferred on certain people while there were others just as entitled to be included who had been excluded. He trusted therefore that the Government would accept this very reasonable Amendment.

MR. HEEHAN said there was no question whatever that the definition at present included many labourers and artisans upon whom farmers depended.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.) regretted very much that the Chief Secretary could not include artisans. Another class of person who ought to be included was the man who lived in a farmhouse and did nothing but agricultural work.

LORD TURNOUR said that, having regard to the fact that Members representing Ireland on both sides of the gangway were in favour of this Amendment, the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised to accept it, as it was in accordance with the whole spirit and intention of the Bill.

MR. O'SHEE said the expression "labourer" should include every person who was engaged in manual work for hire or reward. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman appeared to ignore the fact that during the passing of the Land Act of 1903 they were told that the second definition which was read out was an including and not an excluding definition. Unless some of the Amendments proposed in regard to this Bill were accepted the labourers of Ireland would be looking out for another Bill next year. The position of matters at present was that in consequence of the interpretation put on the definition in the Act of 1903 thousands of labourers would be excluded from the benefits of the Labourers Acts in future. He thought the right hon. Gentleman ought not to overlook that point.

MR. CREAN said many of the labourers were migrating from the country districts to the cities and towns. He hoped the Chief Secretary would accept this Amendment in order that these men might be kept on the land.

MR. BRYCE said he had no knowledge that there had been any decision of the kind indicated by the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman's proposition was to bring in everybody. He would remind the House that these Acts were intended for the benefit of the agricultural labourers. They had been so extended as to bring in everybody who had a proper qualification to be included in the benefits. They did not want to bring in everybody merely because he was a labourer, whatever his income. This was done at the expense of the rates, and considering the extreme latitude of the definition he could not depart from the decision he had already come to.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 137. (Division List No. 251.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh H.
Boland, John
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Farrell, James Patrick
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Ginnell, L.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey, F. W.F(BurySEdm'ds
Hogan, Michael
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale. John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. T. L. Corbett and Viscount Turnour.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Billson, Alfred
Black, A. W. (Bedfordshire)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buxton, Rt.HnSydneyCharles
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH(Sussex, E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herb. J. (Tynemouth)
Crossley, William J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Frank (Radnor
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, Geroge Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

Jowett, F. W.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Maclean, Donald
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morrell, Philip
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herb. L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H.(Ashtonunder Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, W Dudley(Southampt'n
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

MR. BRYCE said he hoped that the House would not allow the Third Reading to be taken.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he wished to submit to Mr. Speaker that it was not in order to take the Third Reading of the Bill at that stage. The Bill had been altered by a considerable number of Amendments which were not on the Notice Paper, and according to "May" a Bill altered on the Report stage could not be read a third time before the Orders of the day had been disposed of.

***MR. SPEAKER** said it was clear that the hon. Member's contention was wrong.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) asked if there was any precedent for a Third Reading being taken without the unanimous consent of the House.

***MR. SPEAKER**: It can be taken with the general consent of the House.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 195; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 252.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A.(Inverness Burghs.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene

Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham,
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh H.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Starkey, John R.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Watson Rutherford and Viscount Turnour.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after Four o'clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 24th July, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

St. Pancras Electricity Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Hackney Electricity Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

London County Council (Money) Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill, Reported, with Amendments.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.], Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Electric Supply) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Leave given to the Select Committee to continue sitting in the absence of the Lord Lyveden.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 173.)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

PETITIONS.

AMBULANCE.

Petition for inquiry as to the desirability of an ambulance service for London; of the Kensington Borough Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3679. Italy: Supplemental Report of Trade of South Italy for 1905.

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Annual statement of navigation and shipping of the United Kingdom, for the year 1905.

STATISTICS.

Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1891 to 1905. Fifty-third number.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account showing the receipt and expenditure of naval prize, bounty, salvage, and other moneys between 1st April, 1905, and 31st March, 1906.

GENERAL PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Order in Council approving of rules made by the general prisons board providing that certain privileges may be earned by convicts through industry and good conduct in prison.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L].

A Bill for the Amendment of the Marriage Act, 1823, was presented by the Lord Ampthill (for the Viscount Ridley); read 1*a*, and to be printed. (No. 174.)

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.]

Commons Amendments to be considered on Thursday next.

DEANERY OF MANCHESTER BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 171.)

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Friday next. (*The Lord Denman.*) (No. 172.)

THE NEW ARMY SCHEME.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE rose to call attention to the reductions in the military forces of the Crown now being made and projected, and the changes in organisation consequent thereon; and to move for Papers.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I am sure that your lordships would be desirous at any time to discuss a statement of military policy made on behalf of the Government, such as was made ten days ago; but I think there are special reasons why your lordships would desire to discuss the last statement of policy before we adjourn for the summer holiday. There have been special circumstances in reference to military policy this session. We have had a new Secretary of State, who has appealed to both sides of the House on the ground that he was new to his business, and that he wanted time to consider any proposals that he would make to Parliament. I am glad to notice that the Secretary of State has acknowledged that his request for time has been loyally recognised by both sides, and I think the noble Earl opposite, the Under-Secretary, will permit me to say that we in this House have not been behind the House of Commons in that matter.

It was not, perhaps, spontaneously that we agreed to the wishes of His Majesty's Government. We agreed rather because we understood that when the proposals were put forward, the fullest possible opportunity would be offered for their discussion. On May 30, the Secretary of State for War, said that he—

> "Did not propose to do anything without the matter coming properly before the House."

and on June 7, he stated that—

> "In July he would be able to make a general statement as to the policy to be adopted by the Government, and then ample opportunity would be given for full discussion."

Now, my lords, that full discussion amounted to four hours, and on the day following the Prime Minister was asked to carry out the pledge that I have quoted to your lordships, and he replied that if members were willing to sit a day longer in the autumn session than they would otherwise have to sit he had no doubt that opportunity would be found for them to "blow off intellectual steam." I regret to say that I have never had the privilege of being a Member of the House of Commons, and therefore I am not competent to judge whether an expression such as that, when applied to speeches by representatives of the people in the discharge of duties for which they were sent to Parliament, would pass for wit or good taste in that assembly; but I say most emphatically that by the course which has been pursued by His Majesty's Government the pledges of the Secretary of State for War have been carried out neither in the letter nor in the spirit. But, my lords, the House of Lords cannot be gagged, and therefore we have a very special responsibility in discussing minutely to-day the proposals of His Majesty's Government.

In initiating this discussion we are in some difficulty, because His Majesty's Government have not followed what I think is the usual course in laying statistics before the House showing exactly what they propose. I have personally, and I am very glad to do so, to acknowledge the courtesy of the noble lord opposite, who has offered to supply me with certain figures, and I am availing myself of his courtesy. I have put down a Motion for Papers. I have a list of them here. They are all of a technical character, and I do not think it would be convenient for me to read the list now; but if the noble Earl could see his way to grant a Return answering my eight or nine questions, the information would, I am sure, be most valuable to your Lordships. But, my Lords, these statistics are not yet in my possession, and therefore it will be necessary for me to-day to refer somewhat in detail to proceedings in the other House. I know that your Lordships do not always like these references, but I shall be erring in good company, because I notice that the Leader of this House in a Debate earlier in the session laid down the following doctrine. The noble Marquess said, in a discussion on the Aliens Bill—

> "There may be some irregularities in these allusions, though they are constantly made in this House. It is the practice when these things have passed into the pages of *Hansard* constantly to allude to them."

Therefore, if I am sinning in alluding too much to Mr. Haldane's actual words in the House of Commons, I can think of nothing better than to shelter myself under the wing of the noble Marquess opposite.

The Secretary of State for War has adopted a motto for his Army reform policy. He states that he is going to reorganise the Army in such a way that it will be fit for war, and that he believes his proposals will increase the fighting efficiency of the Army by fifty per cent., and he proposes to carry this out by very great reductions. As a starting point the Secretary of State says that the condition of our national forces is "highly unsatisfactory." This is a new opinion on the part of the Secretary of State. I have been supplied with an extract from a speech—the extract I am informed has been quoted in another place in the right hon. Gentleman's presence—which Mr. Haldane delivered to Lord Esher's Committee which is now sitting. His words, I am told were—

> "Never before have we had such good material in the Army. The morale both of officers and men is higher than it was. The Army is in a condition in which I do not think it has been before, both in point of quantity and quality."

Since these words were used by Mr. Haldane, and, after all, they only re-echo the words he used in the House of Commons last March, he has been led to believe that the state of the British Army is "highly unsatisfactory." Briefly, Mr. Haldane proposes an expeditionary force of 150,000 men, of which 50,000 are to be regulars, 70,000 reserves, and 30,000 on a Militia basis. I cannot help thinking that this expeditionary force, including its support of Militia, presents no substantial increase in the efficiency of, if it is equal to, the force that we were able to send abroad in 1899. But, as I have said, having set this standard, the Secretary of State for War proposes great reductions. There are, I know, many of your Lordships having special knowledge as regards individual departments of the military forces who are desirous of taking part in this debate, and, therefore, if I pass rapidly over most of the headings touched on in his three hours' speech by the Secretary of State, I do so with the knowledge that they will be developed in greater detail by noble Lords who will follow me.

First, I come to the Artillery. With reference to the Artillery, the Secretary of State has thought fit to make a very severe attack upon his predecessors. These are his words—

> "It seems to have been forgotten"

that the ammunition column for the quick-firing guns will have to be very much greater than the ammunition column has ever been before. And he added—

> "I was appalled at the prospect of having to spend money in creating new additions to the Regular force of Artillery."

My answer to that is that it was absolutely unnecessary for him to create one single unit. The late Government raised, in the last five years that they were in power, seventy-eight new batteries of Artillery. Now, batteries of Artillery do not grow in a day, with their full Reserves, at the touch of a magician's wand. The present Reserve of the Artillery I understand to number 7,500. The full Reserve, as your Lordships will have seen from a letter in *The Times* recently from my right hon. friend Mr. St. John Brodrick, would amount to 30,000. Steps were taken originally to deal with what everybody knew would be a shortage during the first few years of the existence of these batteries. I am informed that Mr. Brodrick, in conjunction with the noble and gallant Field Marshal on the cross benches (Earl Roberts), caused a number of batteries at home, if not all, to be kept at a specially high establishment, in order that they might get a good start in creating a large Reserve, and I believe that during the next three years 10,000 Artillery men will go to the Reserve.

On November 1st last the full strength of the Royal Horse and Royal Field Artillery was 30,612; the Reserve, as I have said, when full would amount to 30,000—a total, roughly, of 60,600. The war establishment of a battery of Royal Horse Artillery is 182, and of Field Artillery 178; so that when mobilised the twenty-eight batteries we have of Horse Artillery would absorb 5,096 men and the 150 batteries of Field Artillery 26,700 men; the depots and riding establishment rather over 2,100 men, and the Indian nucleus for ammunition column 640. This would swallow up a total of 34,572 men, and that deducted from what the full Artillery would have been leaves 26,028 men to cover sick and young soldiers, and for the purposes of ammunition columns. Mr. Haldane assumes that an ammunition column for fifty batteries needs 10,000 men, that is considerably over the Indian scale.

As I have said, however, we knew perfectly well that there would be deficiencies at first, but we made special arrangements to deal with these deficiencies at the moment. Firstly, we had an offer last autumn from a colonel of Garrison Artillery Volunteers at Sheffield, who desired to have them turned into Field Artillery. We promised to give him Erhardt guns, better guns than the Government are now going to give the Volunteers, and in return, among other conditions, he offered that every man he took should make himself liable to join the Artillery Reserve, and he would, therefore, have been available for ammunition columns. We had a similar offer from Lanark, and decisions of the Army Council were taken accepting those offers. I only speak from rumour, but I believe that these decisions were reversed when Mr. Haldane came into office. Secondly, I would show what we did by reading a decision of the Army Council at its seventieth meeting, on November 28th last—

> "There are about 124 companies of Militia Garrison Artillery not allotted to coast defences and surplus to requirements. A scheme is to be formulated showing how these Artillery might be used (a) as a reserve for the Regular siege Artillery; (b) to supplement deficiencies of the Reserve in Horse and Field Artillery by the formation of ammunition columns."

Is it fair, in view of this, in describing what his predecessors have done, for Mr. Haldane to say that the ammunition columns "seem to have been forgotten"?

We are constantly appealed to by noble Lords opposite to refrain from making points in party politics in matters connected with our military forces. It does not help us much to carry out these wishes if the Secretary of State for War cannot refrain from sneering at the action of his predecessors, those sneers being only possible when you take no notice of material facts in the case. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that Mr. Haldane knowingly wished to give anybody a false impression, but his words remain, and I can only assume that they came either from oblivion or from ignorance. I think that the Secretary of State has incurred very great responsibility in giving what is an unfair picture of these things to the country. There was a slight difference between our proposal and Mr. Haldane's proposal. We intended to take the supernumerary regiments of Militia Garrison Artillery, which I believe have never yet been allotted to any known defence scheme. Mr. Haldane, I understand, desires to reduce these, and intends to take others which we were retaining for other purposes; but the difference is very small. The theory underlying his decision and ours is exactly the same.

There are two remarks with reference to Militia Artillery in Mr. Haldane's speech which I should be very glad to have explained. Firstly, Mr. Haldane says—

> "We take thirty-six batteries of new quick-firing guns for a specific purpose. We want to train 20,000 men of the Militia Artillery with those guns."

I should like to know what exactly that means, because later on Mr. Haldane said that—

> "The Militia Artillery must disappear to make room for an increased Regular Artillery."

It may be my dulness — I hope it is — but I should like to have the seeming inconsistency of those two remarks explained to me. I notice in passing that Mr. Haldane alters the terms of service from three years with the Colours and nine with the Reserve to six and six. I think he was quite right to alter some of them to six and six in order to make the drafting question easier, though I do not think there was the same difficulty in getting the three year Artillerymen to extend as with Infantrymen. But altering the whole lot to six and six more than halves the Reserve, for the wastage of men serving with the Colours is greater than it is of men in the Reserve, and the Reserve, as we all know, is admitted not to be big enough in the Artillery yet, though it might have been some day. Anyhow, the net result of Mr. Haldane's proposals is that 3,800 men and sixty-seven officers are taken off the Horse and Field Artillery. By reducing these batteries to two-gun batteries you make, of course, a greater call on your Reserve in time of war, and the Garrison Artillery Militia, we understand, are to be reduced by the redundant Artillery regiments—4,600 men. It is difficult to see how this reduction can result in an increase in the efficiency of the Artillery by 50 per cent.

I now turn to the Guards. I desire to say very little upon the subject of the Guards, because I understand that I am to be followed in this debate by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Temple) who wished to raise this subject last week, and only postponed doing so as the result of representations he received from distinguished quarters. I can assure your Lordships that I leave the case of the Guards to the noble Earl with confidence. I should like, however, to refer to one point. We on this side of the House have maintained that the Guardsman is a great deal cheaper than the Linesman. The cost of the Guardsman and his Reservist is £29 10s., and the Line private, on a seven years basis, costs £40 19s. Mr. Haldane's answer is, "Oh yes, but a Linesman is partly paid for by India, and therefore it is not a fair comparison."

I do not care sixpence whether the Linesman is partly paid for by India or not. The Guardsman defends the Empire at a cost to the Empire of £29 10s. The Linesman defends the Empire at a cost to the Empire of £40 19s. You cannot get away from the fact that the Guardsman is therefore cheaper to the Empire than the Linesman, and it cannot be on grounds of economy that you are reducing the Guards.

It is difficult to know why the Guards are being reduced. There is one reason given by Mr. Haldane for this reduction. It is not on the grounds of efficiency, because it is admitted that the Guards are the best soldiers we have got. It is on the ground of justice. Because you cut off somewhere you must cut off somewhere else. Would the noble Earl the Under-Secretary argue that if a distinguished surgeon wants to take off his little finger he must at the same time take off his little toe on the ground of justice? And yet that is the only tangible argument which has been given by Mr. Haldane. The Guards lose two units and a fifth of their Reserve-making power, and we are again expected to believe that the efficiency of the Guards will be increased fifty per cent. thereby.

Now I come to the Infantry reductions. I am very sceptical about these reductions, especially in Gibraltar. I think I can see the line of thought that has dictated the reduction of one regiment in Malta, but I am very sceptical indeed as to whether the Colonies would agree to this reduction. But I only mention that in passing. I do not wish to enter into the controversy that has hung round an answer which Mr. Haldane gave some weeks ago as to the prophecy he made with regard to what he was going to reduce. Some people understood him to say that the suggestion that he was going to reduce ten battalions was a mare's nest. We now understand that he did not mean battalions, but home battalions; and I confess I was one of those who were led astray. I absolutely accept Mr Haldane's statement as to what he did mean. It may have been inaccurate to suggest that Mr. Haldane was going to reduce ten home battalions, but he is going to reduce battalions at home, and it is rather straining the English language to pour scorn upon people for suggesting that he is actually reducing ten home battalions when he is reducing six of those quartered in this country at the present moment.

I have here some figures in connection with the eight battalions that it is now proposed to reduce. Mr. Haldane states—

> "All these regiments are very largely short,"

and I presume that the fact that they are hort is quoted as justifying their immediate future reduction. These are figures which I obtained in the War Office last year, and they are taken from the book which the noble Earl will recognise, entitled, "The General Monthly Return of the Regimental Strength of the British Army." I am glad that these figures are dated November 1st, because November, as your Lordships will recognise, is a very unfavourable time at which to criticise an infantry battalion, because the real effect of the winter recruiting has not at that moment been fully felt. These are the figures. The 1st and 2nd battalions of the Northumberland Fusiliers, which are not going to be reduced, were practically full. The 1st battalion was two over strength, and the 2nd eight under strength. I am talking now of the rank and file only. The 3rd and 4th battalions were 208 under strength; but against that there were 178 men at the depot, the establishment of the depot being 100, and the regiment had 1,127 men in the Reserve. In the case of the Royal Warwickshire Regiment, the 1st battalion was 161 over strength, and the 2nd battalion 228 under strength, the total deficiency being sixty-seven. The 3rd battalion was fifty-six over strength, and the 4th battalion 307 under strength. But there were 244 men at the depot and 1,250 in the Reserve. In the case of the Lancashire Fusiliers, the 1st battalion was full, and the 2nd battalion deficient by 335 men; the 3rd battalion, in South Africa, was twenty over strength, and the 4th battalion 381 under establishment, but there were 272 men in the depot, the establishment of the depot in all these cases being 100, and 1,294 men in the Reserve. In the case of the Manchester Regiment the 1st battalion was eighty-five over strength, and the 2nd battalion 315 under strength. The 3rd battalion was fourteen under strength, and the 4th battalion 280 under strength. There were, however, 287 rank and file in the depot, and 994 in the Reserve.

Let us mobilise these battalions, that is to say, those at home. Of those abroad, two are up to strength, one has a deficiency of only sixteen, and the fourth, though short, is a battalion of the Northumberland Fusiliers, which, as your Lordships will see, has the largest number of spare Reservists of all the four regiments. I will tell the noble Earl the *data* on which I go. I take the number of men in the battalions at home, deduct 5 per cent. for sick, and 23 per cent. for young soldiers under twenty and under two years service, which is the actual figure founded on the experience of the South African War. Your Lordships will obtain it by an examination of the

Table at page 40 of the Report of Lord Elgin's Commission. I add in the Reserve less 5 per cent. for sick. The result is that on November 1st last year the Manchester Regiment had 1,611 rank and file fit to go to war in two battalions; the Lancashire Fusiliers had 1,802; the Warwickshire regiment 1,898; and the Northumberland Fusiliers 2,107. In every case I have absolutely ignored the depot, which your Lordships will have seen was considerably over strength. The Colonial establishment of two battalions at this moment is 1,592 rank and file. The Indian establishment is 1,880. What is it, therefore, that the Government are doing? They are reducing eight battalions; of these, four are abroad and of these two are up to and over strength, one is deficient by sixteen, a negligible quantity, and one is deficient by 118, but this regiment has far the largest surplus of spare Reservists at home. They are reducing four battalions at home, and these battalions could have gone to war last November 805, 901, 949 and 1,053 strong rank and file only without injuring in the least any other battalion in the regiment, with their full complement of non-commissioned officers, two of them with their full complement of officers, and two of them deficient by one officer each. I do not think it can be urged that these battalions are being reduced because recruiting cannot keep them up, unless recruiting has been stopped for them for some time past. I do not understand Mr. Haldane's statement that "all these regiments are very largely short."

Why, then, are these battalions being reduced? Is it because they are not needed abroad? As I have said, I am sceptical about Gibraltar and Malta, but a new feature has now come on the scene. What about Egypt? Papers recently presented to your Lordships contain the following sentence, written by the noble Earl on the cross-benches, Lord Cromer—

> "The conclusion to be drawn from recent events is abundantly clear. A permanent increase will have to take place in the numbers of the British garrison."

Now, it is not a permanent increase in the numbers of the British garrison to send to Egypt one battalion of Guards which is destined to die. It is always, I believe, a bad thing to reduce a unit that can expand in time of war, but in the present situation, and in view of those words of Lord Cromer, whom nobody will scorn as an alarmist, I think the reduction now proposed by His Majesty's Government can be described as little short of sheer folly. I pass the cavalry and the Yeomanry by. I am gratified to notice that the cavalry are not to be reduced. I would only say that I hope steps will now be taken for completing the cavalry barracks that will certainly be required, the foundation stone of which was laid early last October. As regards the Yeomanry, I would only say that I hope they are not going to be put under the county councils. They are the most satisfactory force we have, and I think His Majesty's Government would be well advised to leave well alone. Now I come to the Militia. What is going to be done with that force? We know that no more money is to be spent on the Auxiliary Forces; we know that 30,000 men are to be put in the expeditionary force on a Militia basis; and we would like to know whether, excepting the Garrison Artillery, these or any of them are to be specially raised. We know that 10,300 Garrison Artillery are to be used for ammunition columns, and the remainder are to be reduced. This involves a reduction, I take it, of 4,600 men. The total strength of the Militia last year was 96,000 men. The Garrison Artillery are to be reduced by 4,600 men. and the Royal Garrison Artillery for ammunition columns and the present Royal Army Medical Corps, who I presume will be used by the expeditionary force, have also to be deducted from this figure—this leaves 80,000 men roughly unaccounted for, or if all the 30,000 for the expeditionary force are deducted there are left 61,000.

We should like very much to know what is going to be done with these. We know that they are to be made liable for service abroad, and I presume that next year we shall have again before us the Bill which was introduced last year, or, at any rate, a similar Bill. I should like very much to know which Member of the Government is going to be in charge of that Bill. I do not think it can be the Under-Secretary of State for War, because he voted against the Bill last year, and he was accompanied by the noble Marquess the Leader of the House, and by Lord Carrington and Lord Denman, and therefore I do not envy the task of the Minister in charge of the Bill next year if he has to meet the determined opposition which I encountered last year from four of his colleagues. I remember that the noble Marquess the Leader of the House gave notice of a Motion upon the occasion of the Second Reading of that Bill. He was not able to move it owing to the forms of the House, but I think it well to remind your Lordships of the terms of the Motion. They were—

> "That this House does not deem it advisable to proceed with the consideration of this Bill until it has before it a full statement of the whole of the proposals of His Majesty's Government for the reorganisation of the Army."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): Will the noble Earl give me the date of that debate?

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: March 30, 1905. Noble Lords opposite cheer the reading of that Motion, but I think we shall be justified in moving a Resolution in those terms next year when the Bill comes before us. We certainly shall be if we know no more than we do this afternoon, and I can promise the noble Marquess most respectfully but most sincerely that I shall keep a very keen eye upon the words of this Motion when the Militia Bill is submitted to us on a future occasion. Of course, it is possible that noble Lords opposite may repent and may next year support the Bill that they opposed last year, in which case I am sure there will be among your Lordships the usual rejoicing over sinners that have been called to repentance. Mr. Haldane stated—

> "We must ask the Militia to form a first line of drafts for the Regular Army in the field. The men will go abroad in their units with their own officers."

I should like very much to know what those units are to be. Are they to be companies or regiments? If companies, it will be nothing but the old evil. For what will happen? The Line battalions go to war. A Militia regiment is paraded, and it is decided that A Company is to go to the front to reinforce the battalions there. The inspecting officer would come down and inspect A Company, and say—

> "Yes, I think it is very satisfactory, but these twenty-five men are not good enough to go to war."

Twenty-five men would then be taken out of the rest of the regiment, and placed into A Company, and away they would go. Reinforcement of the Line, whether you call it by companies or draft, is a vicious system, because it drains the Militia regiments of their best men at the time they most need them. But it is possible that a decision may be come to not to pursue this course, and the Militia may be sent to the front in regiments. If they are to be sent to the front in regiments I am sure every Militiaman will agree with me that they will have to be made very much more efficient than they have been for some years past. The Norfork Commission stated that—

> "The Militia in its existing condition is unfit to take the field for the defence of the country,"

and, therefore, *a fortiori*, to go abroad to fight this country's battles.

The Secretary of State for War talks airily, he says that the Militia is to be filled with new life, that the force is to be surrounded with more democratic and vigorous elements, that the men are to be made into battalions of the Regular Army. I wonder what that means. He is going to lop off weak battalions and to consolidate. What is the definite scheme of the Government for carrying out all these things without extra expense? You are reducing the Regular Army and you say that the Militia are to take their place. Our Regular Army should not be reduced until the substitute is ready at hand to take its place. I believe that it is a well known rule of business, and the Secretary of State is always reminding us that he is a business man, that you should not destroy anything, or, if I may use a phrase that has recently been used by a Cabinet Minister with reference to one of our oldest institutions, you should not put it on the scrap heap until you have something definite to put in its place. In military matters this idea is crystallised in the sentence—"Expansive power in time of war." Mr. Haldane says—

> "Our object has been to produce a force that you could contract or expand,"

and he starts by reducing ten units and making considerable reductions in the Reserve.

Now, what happens when he goes to war with this 150,000 expeditionary force? He has to make good wastage, and he has told us that wastage in war is 80 per cent. per annum. Therefore, he will have to make good a wastage, even if only 150,000 men go to war, of 120,000 men per annum; and of course, while he is doing this, unless the war is in India, he will have to send his normal drafts to India—a total of from 135,000 to 140,000 men. Where are these men to come from? For the present he will keep at home five battalions of the Line, roughly, 4,000 men; two of the Guards battalions; two or three regiments of cavalry, and thirty-six batteries of artillery—eighteen 4-gun batteries, and eighteen 2-gun batteries; and he will also keep the Militia and the Volunteers. I do not think it will be argued for an instant that the Regulars I have just enumerated could keep up a wastage of from 135,000 to 140,000 men. If the Militia or Volunteers are to do it, no plan has been put before us to show how it is to be done. We have had a lot of generalities, but nothing definite. On one occasion Mr. Haldane became quite frank, and said—

> "We are still in a state of consideration about the auxiliary forces;"

but he contradicted this later on by saying—

> "Our scheme deals with a national Army as a whole."

A few crumbs of information are thrown to us. We are told that we are to have a county council system for Volunteers, and if I may adopt a phrase that has recently been used by a distinguished fellow-countryman of my own in another place, I would say that it appears that our Volunteers are to be lumped in with our drains and our religious education. But we are told something more about the Volunteers. We are told that they are to be a sort of second Reserve to the Regular Army. I should like to know whether they are to be engaged in that case to go abroad, and whether all the evils of the drafting of the old Militia Reserve are going to be foisted on the Volunteers. We are told of a Militia Bill. But all these things are childish compared to what we ought to have been told, with reference to a definite scheme on the part of the Government to take the place of what they are doing away with. The Government are not justified in making reductions until they show us something definite that they are going to put in the place of what is reduced. Mr. Haldane says—

> "We may assume that the people will be ready to assume their burden. We may rely in a supreme emergency on the whole strength of the Empire."

Those are pious hopes, not concrete proposals; but the reductions are real, and the Government have refused to delay them even until the autumn. They are commencing to make them at once, but the increased efficiency of 50 per cent. is either an unborn child or a phantom.

I regret extremely the form of these proposals which have been submitted by His Majesty's Government. I am a sincere and whole-hearted devotee of the voluntary principle. Your Lordships will remember a speech delivered a fortnight ago which we all heard with great pleasure, though we may not have agreed with it, by the noble Viscount Lord Milner. We, as I say, could not necessarily have agreed with all of it, but at any rate we must all admit that he produced a concrete scheme. And what answer could we have made to him at that time? Our answer, I have no doubt, would have been—

> "We admit the logical force of your scheme, but the Secretary of State for War is going to make a statement in the House of Commons on Thursday next. We believe he is a strong advocate of expansive power in time of war, and we have no doubt his proposals will satisfy you or answer you."

But what would be our answer to the noble Viscount now if he produced his scheme and asked, "What are you going to do if you do not accept my proposals?"

We could only answer that the Secretary of State for War, who is so very severe on his predecessors because he says they produced paper schemes, has not even the energy to put his own scheme to paper. I should regret at any time to have to conduct an argument against the noble Viscount below the gangway, owing to his great ability and enterprise, but I should be particularly sorry to have to meet his argument with one founded on the brief which Mr. Haldane provided us with ten days ago.

I cannot help fearing that there is some other motive underlying the proposals which have been presented to us. We cannot blind our eyes to the fact that noble Lords opposite have a section among their supporters who care little for any increase in efficiency. They are rather anxious for a reduction in the Regular Army because they regard such reduction as a good thing in itself. Mr. Haldane, in his reply at the end of the debate, almost hinted at his having some feeling of that kind himself, for he said that, after all, it was no chance vote of the House of Commons that demanded this reduction, but that it was demanded by the result of the general election. I wonder how many more mandates are going to be claimed from the ,general election, the chief characteristic, after all, of which was what we have been instructed to call the " terminological inexactitude " about pigtails.

I have recently refreshed my memory by re-reading a document to which I am sure noble Lords opposite will admit some authority as deciding what they should claim they wanted the general election to prove. That document is the election address of the Prime Minister, and whereas I find that a prominent reference is given in that document to servile labour imported in unlimited quantities from China, the only reference to the Army is a condemnation of what he calls the " costly and confused experiments " of his predecessors. There is no direct advocacy of an immediate reduction in the Army for the sake of economy. We recognise, however, that the Secretary of State for War must have had considerable pressure put upon him by those who think a reduction in itself a good thing. But there is an old saying upon which we were all brought up, to the effect that no man can serve two masters. We might perhaps paraphrase that statement by saying that the Secretary of State for War is finding out how difficult it is to satisfy the Liberal Imperialist and at the same time to satisfy that section of opinion which is represented by Mr. Byles and the President of the Board of Trade. But, my Lords, it is because I fear that the Secretary of State has capitulated to these opinions, and that in order to hide that capitulation free discussion of the proposals of the Government has been refused in another place until the autumn, that I have felt it right to make my most solemn protest against the action now contemplated by His Majesty's Government.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the reductions in the military forces of the Crown now being made and projected, and the changes in organisation consequent thereon."—(The Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*)).

Earl TEMPLE: My Lords, I rise to state, as simply as I can, the arguments against the contemplated reduction of the two battalions of Guards, in particular the 3rd Battalion of Coldstream Guards. The Secretary of State for War said in his great speech of the other day—

> "Efficiency must be tempered by justice."

Where is the justice in reducing the Guards battalions by two? According to him, there are seventy-one Line battalions at home and ten Guards battalions. Eight Line battalions are to be reduced against two Guards battalions; a proportion of one in nine to a proportion of one in five. Again I ask, Where is the justice? The greatest reason for the reduction of the battalions is economy. The Secretary of State for War has said that the Guardsman is most expensive, and therefore his numbers ought to be reduced, but I would like to point out that the Guards, when mobilised for war, cost the country £29 per man, and the Line £46 6s. per man.

By their short service system the Guards have a large Reserve; this can be called into being by simply a stroke of the Ministerial pen. The result of this we saw in the late war. Owing to these large Reserves, the Guards battalions went out to South Africa full strength, while very few Line battalions were in the same condition, without the assistance of the Militia. It is true that the Guards do not bear their share of going abroad on foreign service, but, at the same time, they constitute a striking force which can be used at once in case of emergency. I have no need to quote their past history; the names on their colours, such as Waterloo, Inkermann, Egypt, speak for themselves, and the late war in South Africa shows that their efficiency and valour are of the same high standard as they were years ago.

And now I come to the particularly hard case of the 3rd Coldstream Guards. This battalion was the first of the new battalions to be raised; it was formed in 1897; the 3rd Battalion Scots in 1899, and Irish Guards not till 1900. It is true that the last regiment was raised during the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty the late Queen Victoria, but so were the 3rd Battalions Coldstream and Scots, to which battalions consecrated colours were presented by Her late Majesty in person, and it will be admitted that Her Most Gracious Majesty had no greater preference for one battalion than for another. From the point of view of organisation for war and for economy of administration in peace, there can be no question of the advantage of a regiment of three battalions as against two regiments, one of two battalions and one of one battalion.

As regards the hardships of officers and non-commissioned officers, inseparable from reduction in either case, these are more accentuated in the case of the Coldstream than in the Irish Guards. The latter are still young for their position compared with those of the Coldstream. It would be comparatively easy to absorb the officers and non-commissioned officers of the Irish Guards into the regiments from which they came, whereas in the Coldstream a reduction of one battalion will affect promotion in all three battalions. The Coldstream, being an English regiment, draws its recruits from England, the most populous of the countries of the United Kingdom. The strength of the battalion at the present moment is thirty-six above its establishment. As regards officers, there is no lack of candidates qualified for commissions, as is apparent from the fact that there are only four probationers in the Coldstream as against sixteen in the Grenadiers, fourteen in the Scots, and three for one battalion only in the Irish. For the vacancies shown in the Army List as existing in the Coldstream, six names selected from the eight eligible candidates likely to qualify this month have been sent in to the Military Secretary. Surely such facts would go far to justify special consideration being given to the Coldstream, even supposing precedent to be on the side of a reduction of the regiment, but precedent as it happens is entirely against the reduction of the 3rd Battalion Coldstream.

The history of the British Army abounds in instances of increase for war and reduction at the conclusion of hostilities. Since 1660 it has been the invariable practice, after a war, to disband first new regiments in preference to extra battalions of old ones. The present situation has arisen after nearly every war of importance in which this country has been engaged; it has been dealt with uniformly for over 240 years on a natural and logical principle, and it must surely require some very strong reason to justify a departure from historical precedent. Now, I do not believe such a reason exists. I will only quote one example to illustrate the disbandment on a well-defined principle. All through the eighteenth century several regiments had more than one battalion. These were, notably, First Guards and the Royal Scots (the 1st Line). When other regiments were disbanded the 2nd battalions of these regiments were maintained.

In conclusion, accepting the necessity of a reduction of two in the battalions of Guards, considerations of precedent, of the relative seniority and length of service of the officers and non-commissioned officers, of economy of administration in peace, and, above all, of efficiency for mobilisation in case of war, are all in favour of the reduction of the last formed single battalion of Irish Guards, instead of the Coldstream. To my mind, any reduction of the Guards at the present time seems injudicious while there is unrest in Egypt, rebellion in Natal, with the increasing armaments of Germany, and the disturbed condition of Russia. I would therefore urge His Majesty's Government to reconsider their decision in this matter, lest one day the nation should cry in vain, in the words of the Roman Emperor, "Haldane, Haldane, give me back my Guards battalions."

*EARL ROBERTS: My Lords, like every one interested in the welfare and security of the Empire, I read with the most careful attention the statement made by the Secretary of State for War regarding the measures he proposed to adopt for the reorganisation of the forces of the King. With the conviction strong upon me that the majority of my fellow-countrymen have apparently forgotten the way in which their habitual complacency was disturbed only six years ago by the realisation of our unpreparedness for a serious war; with the promises freely made during the late election; and with the strongly-expressed opinions of some of the Members who sit on the same side of the House of Commons as the Secretary of State for War fresh in my memory, I was prepared to hear that reductions, in some form or another, might possibly be considered unavoidable, but I never contemplated that any such serious reduction as the right hon. Gentleman has given notice of would be attempted—a reduction by which 20,000 trained soldiers (42,000, indeed, according to the calculation made by the Military Correspondent of *The Times*) would be lost to the country before any steps had been taken—to use Mr. Haldane's own words—

> "to reorganise the Army in such a fashion that it shall be fit for the only purpose for which an Army is needed—the purpose of war."

and at a time when so much unrest exists in various parts of the world. It was a relief to learn that no decrease in the cavalry is intended, and I earnestly hope that there will be none in the artillery, seeing how few are the number of guns we possess in comparison with those which other Powers have at their disposal. We have less than half the number per 1,000 men that Russia has, and one-third less than Germany has; while—and this is a most important consideration—there are practically no guns for the Militia and Volunteers, or for the native portion of the Indian Army.

As regards the infantry, while recognising that it may not be, for financial reasons, always possible to keep up in time of peace battalions of the same strength as are needed for war, I am filled with dismay at the decision to disband two battalions of the Guards and eight battalions of the Line at the present time. Some decrease in the number of the rank and file of the battalions might, perhaps, be carried out without very great danger, but the loss of ten whole battalions with their full complement of officers is a most serious matter, more especially when it must be remembered that we are just now no less than 7,000 officers short for mobilisation purposes. It is in no carping spirit that I make these criticisms, but from a firm conviction that, if the proposed reductions are carried out now from motives of false economy, troubles will assuredly arise resulting in far heavier expenses having to be met in the near future.

The present disturbances in Natal are, I believe, principally due to every British soldier having been hurriedly withdrawn from that province by the late Government in spite of strongly-worded protests from the local authorities. So with regard to Egypt. Lulled by a fancied security, the garrison of that country was reduced some two years ago, only to be strengthened—permanently, it is said, this time—in consequence of a very general feeling of unrest. And now it is proposed to bring away from South Africa several batteries of field artillery and three battalions of infantry, just at the time when considerable excitement exists in that country, and when the natives, who outnumber the whites by something like ten to one, are showing that they are only kept from breaking out by the knowledge that there are a sufficient number of British troops to keep order.

I should not be so fearful of the proposed reduction if we already had the powers of expansion outside the regular Army recommended by the Royal Commission presided over by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies, or if I could feel satisfied that Mr. Haldane's scheme would give us, within any reasonable time, these powers by the formation of a large potential Reserve of properly trained officers and men, sufficient not only for mobilisation purposes, but for replacing casualties in the field, the loss from disease, and other causes of serious wastage in modern warfare. This, I am convinced, is the only possible remedy for our present unpreparedness.

It is estimated, on competent authority, that a field force requires to replace, in the first year of conflict, no less than 100 per cent. of its original numbers if its fighting efficiency is to be maintained. Russia in her last war with Turkey had to replace her troops in this proportion. The rate of wastage in the Manchurian campaign was even greater, and we must recognise that the final success of Japan in that great struggle was owing, less to the initial numbers placed in the field than to the magnificent manner in which our allies kept their armies up to strength right down to the end of the war. There never has been a more convincing example of the indispensable necessity and priceless value of a national Reserve system. Not one of the hon. Members who took part in the debate in another place appears to have recognised the supreme importance of our having a large Reserve, sufficient and efficient in all respects. Mr. Haldane certainly said that we might rely—

> "in a supreme emergency on the whole strength of the Empire,"

and that he was—

> "not in the least troubled by the alarmist cry of not finding any Reserves behind the Regular forces of the Crown unless you resort to compulsory service,"

and that

> "the keenness and the willingness of our people to give up time to Volunteering and the study of military organisation is one of the striking features we have to deal with."

Such opinions expressed by a Secretary of State for War, when laying before the Committee of the House of Commons a—

> "full statement . . . of the Cabinet's proposals regarding the reorganisation of the forces of the King,"

cause me the gravest concern. I am at a loss to understand how, after the experience of the past, anyone can take such an optimistic view of—

> "the keenness and willingness of our people to give up time to Volunteering,"

considering the small number of men, as compared with the population, who have ever in the past shown any desire to join the auxiliary forces, and the strongly expressed opinion of Lord Elgin's and the Duke of Norfolk's Commissions, as to the unfitness of the members of those forces to be placed in the field against an organised enemy.

I much wonder whether it is realised that, out of an adult male population of fighting age in this country, estimated at over 11,000,000, hardly one man in fifty is enrolled in the Volunteer ranks, and I should much like to know what the Secretary of State for War thinks of "the keenness and willingness" shown by the remaining forty-nine. I readily admit that there is no lack of keenness on the part of the public in giving their views on the difficult and technical subject of military organisation. Every one seems to know exactly how the Army should be organised; indeed, during the last few years War Office administration and Army organisation have been so constantly changed to meet the views of these self-opinionated critics that one can scarcely wonder at the public being, as the noble Marquis the Leader of the Opposition put it the other day, puzzled with regard to the whole subject. This state of bewilderment is likely, I fear, to continue, for while on the one hand two Royal Commissions have pointed out in the clearest possible terms the unfitness of the auxiliary forces for war and the necessity for their being infinitely better trained than they are at present, on the other we learn from the War Minister's statement that no practical system of military training is contemplated; that the training is to be left to the people themselves; in Mr. Haldane's own words—

> "they are to train themselves and organise themselves."

I understand what a national Army means, and I am endeavouring by all means in my power to get my fellow-countrymen to realise how essential it is for the safety of this country and the Empire that we should have a national Army, but such an Army as Mr. Haldane proposes will not in any sense be a national Army, and it certainly will not "be fit for the only purpose for which"—as he rightly says—"an Army is needed—the purpose of war."

You must remember that the "task of the Army"—the purpose for which it exists, as very properly laid down by Mr. Haldane, is for war over-seas, and I am at a loss to understand how anyone can imagine that men trained and organised according to their own lights can ever be fitted for such a purpose. I rejoice at the determination of the Government to make it incumbent on the Militia to serve abroad in time of war; an obligation which, in my opinion, must be extended to the Yeomanry. Of all the proposals made by the Secretary of State, this one is the most practical, and I venture to think that a closer connection between the regular Army and those two portions of the auxiliary forces will be advantageous to both services.

Now we come to the Volunteers. It is proposed to place upon them a very responsible duty—namely, the garrisoning of the great naval forts, to repel raids—such raids being not so "very unlikely" in my opinion as the Secretary of State for War thinks, and—

> "to be a sort of second Reserve for the Regular Army."

I am again at a loss to understand what "a sort of second Reserve" means, nor is it apparent how many Volunteers would be available for this purpose. If the Army is to be called upon to take part in a great war, either for the defence of India or on account of "Continental complications," an infinitely larger Reserve than the balance of the Volunteer force could furnish will be needed. It is necessary that this fact should be realised, and that there should be no uncertainty as to the number of men that could be placed and maintained in the theatre of war, a necessity that neither Mr. Haldane nor any of the hon. Members who spoke on the subject in the House of Commons seemed to have appreciated.

I am aware that if the war were to be on the North-Western Frontier of India it

might not be necessary to despatch from this country, at once, enough men to bring the Army of India up to the strength that would eventually be needed—not less in my opinion than 500,000 men—but that number would assuredly be required before very long, in a far shorter time than that in which men could be trained and a Reserve formed if no organisation existed, and if the men on whom we would have to depend to form it were left "to train themselves and to organise them-selves."

Again, if we were required to deal with a "Continental situation," a striking force of much greater strength than 150,000 men would, in my humble opinion, be needed, if not at the very outset, long before any large number of reinforcements could be trained. We should under these circumstances be fighting against a most carefully organized army between two and three millions strong, and thoroughly fitted in all respects for war, the commanders of which would be fully cognisant of our unpreparedness and would give us as little breathing time as possible. I doubt whether it is realised by many persons in in this country that the Continental armies, behind their vast mobilised strength, possess practically unlimited reserves. In Germany, for instance, though it is usually supposed that only about 5,000,000 men would be subject to the extreme demand of the State, there are altogether actually no less than 10,000,000 men over fighting age who have passed through the ranks at one period or another. It is true that these enormous numbers are not nominally liable for service in the first instance, but they exist, and would be available for the last emergency.

The voluntary system has, in the last hundred years, been applied under every possible variation to every one of our heterogeneous military forces. The four branches of our military organisations, each competing with the other for recruits and financial support, are, in themselves, the outcome of the desire to suit the varied circumstances of men in all positions of life. The terms of enlistment for the regular Army have been varied every few years, the physical standard has been lowered, the pay has been increased, the food, accommodation, and comfort of the soldier have been enormously improved. A similar process has taken place in all branches of the Auxiliary Forces. Financial concessions, increased grants, and extended privileges have gone hand in hand with more elastic requirements as to efficiency. Yet what is the result ? The verdict of the Elgin and Norfolk Commissions was a complete condemnation of the efficiency of the forces obtained under the purely voluntary system; both Mr. Haldane and Mr. Arnold-Forster declare that it is enormously costly, and, as regards numbers, the Army Estimates show that the Regular forces are 17,000, the Militia 37,000, and the Volunteers 102,000 short of their establishment.

The voluntary system, under a high-sounding name, is simply a method by which men who can afford to do so pay others to perform a necessary task for them. As regards the Regular Army the essential function of which is to garrison our oversea dominions, the principle is perfectly legitimate and reasonable, and its success depends simply upon the readiness of men to take up a military career for the price offered—a readiness which has always been in inverse ratio to the progress of industry and the growth of luxury. But, when the voluntary system is applied to the Reserve forces of a nation, as in the case of our Volunteers, it is merely an unfair method of getting the willing and the patriotic to do for their country a service which can only be properly done if it is shared by all. The inevitable result of a great struggle fought under the voluntary system would be that the defence of the country would fall entirely on the thoughtful, patriotic men who had prepared themselves beforehand, and the nation would lose a large proportion of her best citizens and truest-hearted men whom it could ill afford to spare, while it would be left with those who had neglected their plain duty, and who the country could well do without.

The system is essentially unjust, though the injustice may be hidden under fine phrases, and condoned by people glad to avoid the obligation which they prefer to fulfil by proxy, and under such a system the standard of efficiency has no direct connection with the idea of preparation for war. It is simply the standard accepted by men who, having other occupations which cannot be interfered with, are not able to afford the financial loss which any raising of the standard involves. What would be thought of a proposal to raise taxes by voluntary contributions, or how could we hope to run any business on the understanding that the *employes* would turn up for work as often as it suited their convenience ? The absurdity of such an idea strikes us at once, yet this is precisely the principle on which we carry on the most serious business with which a nation can be called upon to deal—the defence of its safety in a great struggle for existence.

It is quite clear to me that we shall never have an Army upon which we can depend for the defence not only of the Empire, but of these islands, until our fellow-countrymen realise the fact that a very large Reserve will be needed, and that both officers and men must be properly trained. Owing to our insular position, and to our never having had (until the South African War) to fight out battles without the assistance of allies, this fact has never been brought home to the people, and now, notwithstanding the experience of our shortcomings gained in the late war, instead of their being plainly told that they must in future depend upon themselves, and that the safety of their homes and of this great Empire cannot be secured unless they are prepared to undergo a certain amount of self-sacrifice, they are led to believe that the Regular Army is unnecessarily large, and that all that is needed in the matter of reinforcements, when war breaks out, can be provided in ample time by an insufficiently trained and insufficiently officered Auxiliary force.

As I said in this House last year, the Army may be reformed to the end of time, its system of administration may be changed as often as the Government of the day may see fit to change it, and yet we shall be no nearer than we are at present to the solution of our difficulties as regards our having the kind of Army we require for our peuliar needs and responsibilities. That solution, my

Lords, must depend upon the people identifying themselves with the Army, and realising that it is not only a duty but a privilege for every man to be able to defend his country, and, within certain limits of age, to be prepared to take his part in the defence of the Empire.

I was taunted when I last spoke in this House with being an advocate for conscription, and long extracts were read by the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War from some report, showing the enormous expense that would be incurred, and the hardship that would be entailed, by conscription being made applicable to this country. In reply to the noble Earl, I would again repeat, what I have frequently stated before, that conscription as understood by Continental nations is inapplicable to this country. The greater portion of our Army is always serving abroad, and an army which has to serve abroad could not possibly be kept up by the Continental system of service. But besides this Army we have the Auxiliary forces. For these forces conscription, as understood by Continental nations, is not necessary either, for the duty of garrisoning the country is not required of them. Their existence at all, however, is a tacit acknowledgment on the part of the nation that more men are required for war purposes than can be provided by the Regular Army. In other words, that, in the event of a great national emergency, we should be deficient in fighting men unless the Regular Army can be supplemented by other means.

What I want to see, my Lords, is the principle of the duty of national defence applied to this country—the principle which lays down that it is the duty of every man to be trained, and trained thoroughly, for the defence of his country. The spirit that existed for centuries from the days of our Saxon forefathers in our old constitutional force—the Militia—the spirit which founded our military glory upon the fields of Creçy and Poictiers, when we possessed the only national organisation in Europe. I want to see this body of men, whether it is called the Auxiliary forces, or the national Army, or the territorial Army—I want to see them trained for the only purpose for which we are justified in spending money on them—namely, the supplementing of our small Regular Army, whenever it is found that that Army is not numerically strong enough to carry through its task alone.

Surely there is all the difference in the world between a nation, every man of which is obliged to serve in the ranks of the Regular Army and perform, as is the case on the Continent, while in those ranks, all the onerous duties of a regular soldier during times of peace and for small wars, and a nation which, while maintaining a Regular Army for foreign service, asks every man to undergo such a training as will fit him to take a useful part in a great national emergency, when every true Briton would certainly volunteer, and only the shirkers, the unpatriotic, and the disloyal would be content to remain passive.

I must confess that the present state of the national temper fills me with deep misgiving. It is the old story so often repeated in the annals of human nature, so familiar to us in the case of individuals, and so often and so disastrously exemplified in the history of nations. The gravest warnings are forgotten when the immediate emergency is passed. In fact it is a case of when—

> "The Devil was sick, the Devil a monk would be.
> "The Devil was well, the Devil a monk was he."

Democracies like ours, occupied by many issues in the hurried and confused distractions of Party politics, are too easily lulled into a false security by superficially reassuring symptoms, in which no solid guarantee of safety exists. No nation in the world's history has ever been allowed to continue for long upon such easy terms as we at present enjoy. We are led into an entirely false dependence by reason of our alliances. But I would ask whether we grasp clearly what that dependence really means. Paradoxical as it may seem, the maintenance of the voluntary system of this country, dispensing with a real national Reserve, and involving drastic reductions in our barely adequate peace establishment, is only possible at the present moment because of the success of universal service in another country. Our alliance with

Japan, as I need not remind you, is the foundation of the present diplomatic security upon which we rely. The advantages of that alliance are mainly derived by both the partners to it from the success of the Japanese in the late war with Russia.

But the success of the Japanese again was secured because of the adoption by that enlightened and progressive nation—who, like ourselves, are islanders and a naval as well as a military people—of that patriotic system of national service first introduced nearly 100 years ago in preparation for the great German struggle for liberty. Our allies in the Far Eastern conflict spent the utmost of their strength without stint. They mobilised their whole resources by land and sea. Although the issue was decided in a theatre of war comparatively close to their own shores, if we judge by the Imperial standard of distance, they needed all the resources they possessed. They had to call into play the full power of the great national reserve formed by the system of general manhood training. That national system, adopted by Japan after the Continental model, prevailed where no other system could have hoped to prevail, and nothing but the success of universal service in the Manchurian war and the treaty which followed enables us to continue our own voluntary system, to reduce our military Estimates, to cut down the artillery and infantry of our Regular Army, and to flatter ourselves with the fallacious hope that we can maintain our vast Asiatic dominion without following the example of other nations.

Our Empire can never endure upon any other basis than our own ability to defend it successfully, and without a national Reserve it cannot be defended at all, for even a victorious Army without the means of continuous reinforcements behind it must disappear. And, my Lords, this great Reserve, whether it be in the form of a national Militia or under some such territorial organization as proposed by the Secretary of State for War, cannot be provided upon a voluntary basis except at a prohibitive cost. It is clearly, my Lords, upon the question of the expense entailed, by comparison with the number of men it produces, that the voluntary system is breaking down.

If we are to have an Army sufficient in all respects to meet our requirements without incurring a heavy expenditure, the voluntary system must be abandoned, so far as the national Reserve portion is concerned. Under present conditions we can have an Army without economy or economy without an Army. We cannot have both together unless we apply the lessons of the South African war, with a boldness equivalent to the severity of those lessons, by a total reconstruction of our machinery. There is considerable force, my Lords, in the demand for economy, but if we reduce our Regulars before we have actually provided the organised Reserve to replace them, we shall be undertaking more serious risks than any possible saving of money under the voluntary system can be worth. Let the great and patriotic task of providing a Reserve by training the general manhood of the nation—much to their moral and physical advantage in every walk of life—let that work be at last earnestly undertaken and I do not think it will be difficult to devise a system by which every able-bodied man shall receive sufficient training to enable him to take his place in the ranks in time of a great national crisis without his having to join the Army as a Regular soldier, and with as little interference as possible with his civil calling.

It is quite possible, my Lords, that with a system of this kind you might be able to make an even more sweeping reduction than is now contemplated and obtain complete Imperial security without increasing the present expenditure. It might be found possible to reduce the cost of an Army which is not prepared for war, while it remains without an efficient and sufficient Reserve, and also the cost of the Auxiliary Forces which do not supply a real Reserve, and are not "auxiliary" in any true meaning of the word. My Lords, this is indeed the only alternative to vast expenditure. I hope that this country will accept it in time to escape the fate of those nations which were repeatedly warned in vain. It seems to me that peoples and empires have never been taken unawares. When we look back upon history we see that those overtaken by the greatest disasters have been incredibly blind to the meaning of what was passing around them, and to the plainest warnings. I pray, my Lords, that we may not be so overtaken, and that we may use the providential interval which our present alliances and friendships give us so as to ensure that we shall hand down unimpaired to posterity the Empire we have received from our forefathers.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: My Lords, in the case of the Regular Army we have been informed of the number of battalions it is proposed to reduce, but in reference to the Militia we know there is to be reduction, but we do not know the extent, I note that the Secretary of State for War says in his statement—

> "We propose to take the 124 battalions of Militia we have now; to review them, to lop off weak battalions, to consolidate them so as to make more efficient battalions, and to put behind every Regular battalion of the Home Army a third or Militia battalion."

There are seventy-one battalions of the Regular Army at home, so that if each battalion had a third or Militia battalion, that would mean a reduction from 124 battalions to seventy-one. That is a reduction of fifty-three battalions. In the case of the consolidation of Militia battalions that can, I believe, be effected only by Act of Parliament, whereas the Secretary of State for War can disband any Militia battalion. I trust the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War will be able to give some information as to the nature of the reductions in the Militia. The Government, moreover, intend to change the conditions of service in the Militia. Under our system of voluntary enlistment that means a re-arrangement of the terms between employer and employed, and the question arises whether employer and employed will come into agreement or whether they will not.

I propose, therefore, to invite your Lordships' attention, first, to the present conditions of service in the Militia; secondly, to the conditions which the Government seek to impose upon the Militia; and lastly, to the exact form of service which the Militia, at least as far as I understand the feeling of the force, is prepared to offer to the country. I must explain that I am dealing only with the Infantry Militia, and consequently by organised unit I mean a battalion of infantry.

Your Lordships are aware that there are two distinct policies regarding the use of the Militia. The Militia may be regarded as a Line recruiting agency in time of peace, and for passing drafts into the Army in time of war, or it may be regarded as a self-contained force of the second line, designed to expand the Regular Army in the field by organised units. In the first case it is a draft-providing force, and in the second it is an expanding force, the distinction between reinforcing by drafts and expanding by units being as follows. If a Militia battalion is sent to take its place in the field alongside a Line battalion, you will have two battalions where you formerly had one. That is expansion by units. On the other hand, if men are drafted from the Militia battalion into the Line battalion, then where there was one battalion you remain with one battalion. There is no expansion of units, there is only re-inforcement by drafts.

Until the recent statement on Army organisation made by the Secretary of State for War, the necessity for expansion outside the limits of the regular Army was universally considered to be the great lesson which we had learnt from our experience in the South African war. But His Majesty's Government have rejected the finding of the Elgin Commission on the need for organised expansion outside the limits of the regular Army. They propose to provide an expeditionary force of 150,000 men to be maintained for six months by drafts of 50,000 men derived from many sources. But after the first six months this force is without any means of expansion by organised units. The provision of the new battalions, regiments and batteries which we must create if the calamity of war with a first class Power comes upon us, is left to the spontaneous patriotism of the masses, stimulated by the strain and stress of a great war, and guided into military channels by local associations controlled by civilians.

His Majesty's Government, then, having decided against the policy of expansion outside the limits of the Regular Army by organised units, consequently require the Militia to be a Line recruiting agency and a draft-providing force for the Regular Army. I note that the Secretary of State for War in his statement says—

> "The Militia must accept the obligation to go abroad in time of war, and to form a first line of drafts for the Regular Army in the field."

But before the Government can effect this, a constitutional transformation of the Militia will be necessary. The Militia at the present moment is governed by the Militia Act of 1882. There are several points in that Act to which I must draw your Lordships' attention. First, under Section 13 of the Act the oath of allegiance taken by the Militiaman binds him to serve in the Militia and not in the Regular Army. Secondly, by Section 12 of the Act the Militia is enlisted for service in the United Kingdom only, and not for service overseas. Thirdly, by Section 8 the Militiaman is enlisted in a certain county for service in the Militia regiment belonging to that county; and lastly, by Section 4, subsection 4, he cannot be transferred from the battalion into which he enlists to any other battalion in the service, except by his own consent. In these provisions rests the whole nature of Militia service as distinguished from Line service, and none of them can be revoked or varied except by Act of Parliament. Such are the present conditions of service in the Militia.

I now come to those conditions which the Government desire to impose upon the Militia. The Militiaman is bound by his oath of allegiance to serve in the Militia and not in the Regular Army. Now I note that the Secretary of State for War says—

> "What we are anxious to do is to take the Militia battalions and make them battalions of the Regular Army."

Very well, then the Government must alter the Militiaman's oath accordingly. By altering the Militiaman's oath from Militia service to Army service, the whole Militia, as it has hitherto existed as a national institution in this country, is abolished. Next the Militiaman is to be enlisted for service abroad. But I am not sure if the Militiaman is to take the liability for foreign service at the moment of enlistment or to become liable for foreign service when the Militia is embodied by Parliament. It makes a great difference to the Militia, and I beg to refer the point to the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War. The question of foreign service for the Militia on embodiment was before your Lordships' House last year. As far as I am aware, Militiamen are quite ready to accept foreign service enlistment on embodiment, but upon the conditions offered last year and not on the terms proposed this year.

Lastly, the Government require the Militiaman to surrender his immunity from drafting. No Militiaman can at present be transferred from the battalion into which he first enlists without his own consent. The Government propose to withdraw this provision of the Act of 1882 to enable them to draft the Militia to the Line. Now this immunity from drafting is very dear to the Militiaman. A Militiaman, if he wishes to go to the Army, will do so directly after joining the Militia, but, if he remains in the Militia, it is because he means to have nothing to do with the Regular Army and means to serve in the Militia regiment into which he enlisted and in no other.

The whole question of foreign service enlistment for the Militia turns upon this point of drafting Militiamen to the Line. Previous to and during the South African War, there was a form of enlistment in the Militia which has recently been abolished, known as the Militia Reserve. It was a complicated form of enlistment under which men took a new oath and accepted service in the Reserve of the Regular Army, and received a sovereign a year. It was then enacted by the Reserve Forces Act that when Militiamen so enlisted were called out for service with the Line, they became for all intents and purposes soldiers of the Regular Forces, and were liable to be transferred to any corps. This form of service was accepted by the men in a gambling spirit. Many won in the sense that they got their sovereign a year for many years, completed their term of service in the Militia, and were never sent to the Regular Army. Many were hard hit by the South African War, when the Militia Reserve was sent to the Regular Army and drafted in all directions. It proved a most unpopular form of service, not because the men objected to going abroad, but because they objected to being drafted to the Line. It has been abolished, but the recollection is fresh in the minds of the men.

The Secretary of State for War has admirably described the result of this form of service on the Militia. In the month of March last the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I should like to see the Militiaman used, not in the disastrous manner he was used until a very short time ago. He was an institution very valuable for military purposes, almost a pure Regular Reservist. That was the system under which the Militia was first bled white for the Regular Army, and then asked to go in their depleted battalions to fight. It was fatal to the Militia and it has never recovered."

It comes therefore in the nature of a surprise to the Militia that His Majesty's Government in July proposes to establish the exact system of service for the whole Militia which was condemned by the Secretary of State for War in March as fatal for the Militia, when applied to a section of that force.

Of course, to furnish a first line of drafts for the Regular Army in the field is drafting in its widest sense. But apparently the drafting is to be qualified by drafting from the Militia battalion by companies under their own officers to the territorial battalion. That sounds very well in the ears of the public, who know nothing about drafting, but to the Militiaman who does know about drafting, it brings no mitigation of the evil. It does not matter as far as the Militia battalion is concerned whether you draft by companies, by sections, or by the individual. All alike bleed the battalion. A battalion once having sent one or two companies to the Line can never take the field, except in a miserably depleted condition, exactly the same as in the South African war. If a Militia company is to be ordered abroad under its own officers as a draft to its Line battalion, is it possible, is it likely, or is it desirable to keep that particular company in a water-tight compartment in the Line battalion? Of course not; it must be absorbed into the Line battalion just as a draft going out from the Line, and the sooner the better. The Militia company officers will, I presume, be the junior officers of their rank on joining the Line battalion, and thus the Militia officers and men will pass away from their own battalion under the command of Line officers. I am confident that this system of drafting will not be accepted either by the company officers or by the men of the Militia.

The only way of persuading the Militiamen now serving to accept foreign service enlistment is by means of the commanding officers explaining to their men the altered conditions of the defence of the Empire and of the United Kingdom which require foreign service enlistment, and secondly by assuring them that their interests will be as securely safeguarded by Parliament in the future as they are at present. But since the Government propose to alter the Militia Act of 1882 on the subject of drafting, it will be necessary to explain that alteration to the men, and also to say that at the same moment when they are asked to accept the additional liability for foreign service, they are required to surrender that immunity from drafting now conferred upon them by Act of Parliament. Finally, that for making themselves liable for a much more onerous and to them distasteful form of service, namely, drafting, they are to receive nothing.

If the Militia is to be changed into a draft-providing force for the Line, the position of the commanding officer becomes as follows: He must advise his men to accept foreign service enlistment on the score of duty and patriotism. He must at the same time inform them that he himself is never likely to take them abroad in person. He is to ask his men to serve under his command in peace, and to hand them over to someone else in time of war, presumably because he himself is considered incompetent to go with them. That is an intolerable position for a commanding officer.

I now come to that form of service which I believe the Militia to be quite ready to offer to the country. I think that the Militia would agree to enlistment for foreign service on embodiment, provided always that the provisions of the Militia Act of 1882 regarding drafting remain in force. The Militia desire to remain and to serve as Militia and not be converted into Regular battalions. The ambition of the Militia is to become a properly organised self-contained force as the second line of the Regular Army, and for the purpose of expanding the Regular Army by organised units. It would seek to become better both in quality and in quantity, in quality by a longer recruits' training; in quantity by, if possible, a shorter annual training, thus mitigating that dislocation of civil life which keeps so many men out of the Militia. It would aim at fitness to proceed abroad after a short period of embodied training. With the definite and important duty of acting as the second line of the Regular Army, all brand of inferiority would be removed from the Militia, and the whole *status* of the force would be raised.

Such, then, are the services, which, I believe, the Militia is ready to offer to the country. I regret therefore to perceive from the statement of the Secretary of State for War that service of this nature is not likely to be accepted at the present moment by his Department. The Government have made it quite clear that they will only retain those men who give them exactly the form of foreign service which they require. Therefore, the Militia must be prepared, since for the moment their services are supposed to be of no value to the country, to have their services dispensed with. If His Majesty's Government are able to place their hands at any time upon men who are willing to give them the exact form of foreign service which they require, then his Majesty's Government have solved the whole problem of the British Army. I have no doubt that they will tell us the solution in due season. They have not done so yet.

Passing from the likes and dislikes of the individual Militiaman, an all important point under voluntary enlistment, because if there is no Militiaman there is no Militia, I would consider for a moment the policy of changing all the Militia into a drafting force for the Regular regiments. In the first place, it prohibits the expansion of the Regular Army by the only force which can furnish organised units for that purpose and which did so during the recent war. In the second place, so long as the administration of the War Office rely on skimming the Militia, they will become careless about the condition of the Army Reserve. Before the South African war we had seven years colour service and five in the Reserve. After the South African war, we had three years colour service and nine in the Reserve; then nine years colour service and three in the Reserve. Now it is to revert to seven years colour service and five in the Reserve. How can there be any steady flow in or out of the Reserve with such violent fluctuations of service? But so long as the War Office can skim the Militia they can embark with a light heart and a light head on those disastrous experiments we have seen tried on the Reserve. Moreover, skimming the Militia and not caring for what is left after that process has been done, is in itself a wasteful policy.

Now what kind of force will the Government have created when they have turned the Militia into pure Regular Reservists for drafting purposes to the Line? It will be an entirely new Force. It should come under the Reserve Forces Act and not under the Militia Act. It will be unattractive as far as commanding officers are concerned for the reasons I have given. Then as to company officers; is it likely that anyone in civil life will assume such a serious liability as that of foreign service for the sake of the dreary and uninspiring surroundings of a mere drafting force? As to men, you will certainly not get those men who are ready to give Militia service and not Line service, because they mean to serve in the Militia and not in the Regular Army. You will get a great number of undersized boys, provided always that you have a considerably lower standard for the Militia than for the Line. These boys will enlist because they are dead-beats in civil life, but they will join the Line as soon as they reach the minimum standard. They must do that for they are not good enough for the civil labour market.

Under these conditions I beg to ask how is the Government going to keep the ranks of this new force full of Regular Reservists? But this is not a question of what is better for the Militia or better for the Line, any more than in the case of reductions in the Regular Army it ought to be a question of what is fair to the Guards and unfair to the Line. If the Guards battalions add more quickly to the Reserve of the Army that is the point to consider. It is not a question of what is better for any particular Force, but what is best for the combined efficiency of all Forces. The feeling of the Militia is that the policy of expansion as defined by the Elgin Commission is the right one, and that is the form of service they offer to the country.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, I do not know whether it is necessary for me to mention that I shall be perfectly willing to give the noble Earl who raised this question, the statistics for which he has asked. Before I attempt to deal with the several criticisms which have been raised by several speakers in this House and by letters in the public Press, I wish to remind your Lordships that to those who maintain that any reduction in the Army is inexpedient my reply is that the public in general and His Majesty's Government in particular have decided that the public interest demands a reduction; this is in the interest of the Army as well as of the public.

The Army must be saved from any sudden stroke. We are not prepared to agree to any violent reduction in the Army and this we feel might have come at any time if we had not shown that within the limits of reason and reasonable requirements we recognised as fully as anyone the need for economy. This is a question which is not one of any particular Department, but in the decision of which, as my noble friend Lord Grimthorpe said in his admirable speech of July 10th, we have to weigh general considerations, the probable exigencies of our foreign affairs, and the condition of the public finances. The annual cost of the Army has risen during the last ten years by £10,000,000, or 30 per cent., and the number of men nearly 50,000.

It seems to be clear that the late Government were realising the public obligation that was daily forcing itself upon their minds as to the necessity of economy. I do not think that the late Prime Minister would contradict me were I to say that in 1904 he was elaborating a scheme of very considerable reductions both in battalions and establishments, and the late Secretary of State for War expressed himself very emphatically in that direction in a Paper presented to the House of Commons on July 14th, 1904. In that Paper, summarising his re-organisation proposals, Mr. Arnold-Forster says—

> "But the country wishes to see this addition (the automatic increase in Estimates) wiped off and a great economy made also. The country is right; but it must be clearly understood that 'he who wishes the end wishes the means.' It is of no use to say there must be great reductions in Army expenditure, if everybody concerned resolutely refuses to accept any reduction in those items which involve expenditure."

Mr. Arnold-Forster went on to say—

> "What is it that makes our great Army expenditure necessary? There can be but one answer. It is the number of men we employ. Can we spend less money with fewer men? Undoubtedly we can. In the Navy it is the Shipbuilding Vote that is the principal item of cost. In the Army it is the number of men that governs all other Votes. If we want to spend less money we must have fewer men."

Well, my Lords, we want to spend less money; our mandate from the country is to spend less money, therefore we must have fewer men.

I notice without any excessive surprise that in his letters to *The Times* newspaper the late Secretary of State for India, who assumes with the late Secretary for War to be our special mentor upon War Office administration, says nothing as to any general continuity of policy. He is as detached in his reference to his predecessor as his successor is in regard to his exploits, but if, as Mr. Brodrick says in his letters, we have incurred a national calamity and surrender, he has turned his artillery against the late Secretary of State, his own colleague, quite as much as against us.

Accepting as an accomplished fact that the Government have as a general principle decided to make reductions, I I feel that your Lordships will be interested to hear some of the details of our proposals, and I think when they are examined much misapprehension will be removed as regards any loss of military efficiency and as regards any hardship to the *personnel* of the Army itself. Our task is to make the best use of the funds at our disposal, to cut down ruthlessly whatever makes for show in order to concentrate our expenditure upon developing fighting efficiency. And when I am speaking of fighting efficiency, I would venture to point out that, in all calculations for war, whether as affecting invasion of our own shores or for maintaining the rights of our Empire abroad, we must consider the Army, not as our only weapon, but taken in conjunction and in relation with our other arm, the Navy, which it is admitted must be the basis of our supremacy.

My Lords, we are endeavouring to promote a continuity of policy. The late Government, with perfect justification, took pride in the fact that (1) they had instituted a body in the Committee of Imperial Defence for the purpose of co-ordinating naval and military policy and for taking a comprehensive view of the defence of the Empire—and I do not think we can over-estimate the value or services of this body; (2), that they had established an Army Council in place of the previous unsatisfactory system; and (3) as regards the Army, most vital of all, that they had projected a General Staff and thereby the foundation of a scientific Intelligence Department. My Lords, we have followed the lines we found to hand; we have endeavoured to utilise these several agencies in their respective spheres.

The Committee of Imperial Defence has decided that certain changes can be safely made in the defence of the Empire. Consequently we have resolved upon the withdrawal of two battalions from Malta and one battalion from Gibraltar because they have become naval rather than military stations. The Government having decided that expenditure must be curtailed, the General Staff has worked out the best means of meeting the new situation, and the Army Council has given the fullest attention to the details of the new organisation, which has received the unanimous approval of the military members, and I am not aware that this has in the past been always the case.

Whatever criticism—and I would assure your Lordships that we are not impatient of criticism—may be directed against the details in our proposals, it cannot be said that the Secretary of State for War has acted without the greatest caution and the fullest consultation and with the entire concurrence of his colleagues on the Army Council. We begin by recognising the principle now generally adopted that the main object of our regular Army is to garrison the chief outposts of our Empire in peace and to defend the threatened portion or portions in time of war. The first of these objects, in the deliberate opinion of the Committee of Defence, will be met by the retention of not more than seventy-seven battalions in India and the Colonies, and following from this, the maintenance of at least seventy-one battalions at home to furnish the necessary drafts for these battalions. This object I think I can say the Secretary of State's scheme undoubtedly achieves.

The second object—the task of the Regular Army in war—is to be ready either to wage the small wars that occur from time to time through the liabilities of the Empire, or to mobilise for the early stages of a big war. For this object we require a striking force, and the figure set down by the Secretary of State for War is at least as strong as that contemplated by his predecessor. The figures of our expeditionary or striking force are 5,546 officers and 154,074 men, composed roughly of 50,000 Regulars serving with the colours, 70,000 Regular Reservists, 30,000 Militiamen who under our proposals are to be trained as a support of the Regular Army available on mobilisation, and who have already satisfied the requirements of the General Staff.

As regards the artillery, we have been subject to what I do not think I am exaggerating in describing as torrents of criticisms, but the Secretary of State for War's plain statement that we had guns but no men to man them has never been challenged. We have been told that in a year or two the Reserve of Artillerymen would have grown to the necessary proportion. That may be so, but surely it is a somewhat strange explanation from the very persons who are never tired of emphasising Lord Roberts' motto that the nation is absolutely unprepared for war, and that war may occur at any moment. It is equally strange from the persons who say in reference to the Government's scheme for a territorial Army, "Our potential enemies will not suit our convenience by delaying until we have made the territorial army effective," for artillery is admittedly one of the weapons of war which should be ready at once and for immediate use.

My Lords, we have only reduced the imaginary strength of the artillery. For practical purposes, for readiness for war, we have increased the fighting efficiency of the artillery. We want more men trained to fill the ammunition columns and we want more trained gunners. We propose to make use of the Militiaman, whom we intend to train under our general scheme. He will be given ammunition column work where no such men at present exist, or the Militiaman will be given work, not the highest gunning work, but work which will enable him, in case of emergency, to take the place, after very little extra training, of the expert gunner in the firing line. There will be no reduction in the artillery till trained Militiamen liable to serve abroad can take their place. There will be no stoppage of recruiting for the artillery till militiamen who are liable to serve abroad take their place. Our critics have, I think, never realised either the present condition of things or what our proposals are. We have, first and foremost, to confront the fact that although on paper our strength is ninety-three batteries, yet owing to its having been overlooked that these ninety-three quick-firing batteries necessarily demanded a greater complement of men to man them, if war were declared to-morrow, the effective strength of our artillery would only be forty-two. We have ninety-three batteries, but only sufficient men to man forty-two. At present we have about 17,000 regular artillerymen ready to mobilise, and an additional 3,000 unfit from under-age or shortness of service. But even reckoning this latter number of 3,000, if we wanted to mobilise forty-two batteries of artillery, we should have to call upon every man of the whole 20,000 to whom I have referred, and then we should be at the very end of our resources. We should then be in the unenviable position of having fifty more batteries without the men to equip them.

Well, my Lords, we propose to get out of this difficulty by utilising trained Militiamen for work that, in the opinion of the General Staff, can be given them with perfect safety. This principle, which, by the way, it is satisfactory to note also occurred to the late Secretary of State for War, enables us to equip sixty-three batteries on a peace basis as strong as that adopted by the great Continental Powers. If noble Lords wish it I can give them the details. At the same time we are maintaining a proportion of five guns to every 1,000 bayonets, which is at least as strong as any European country maintains. In fact our proportion will be rather stronger. I have had the following figures supplied to me by the experts. France has a proportion of three and a-half to every thousand and Japan four and a-half to every thousand.

While dealing with the question of the artillery I would like to refer to a comment that appeared recently in *The Times* on the alterations contemplated in this line of the Service, and to which the noble and gallant Earl on the Cross Benches (Earl Roberts) alluded. The suggestion was that the Indian Army is at present short in that arm, and, therefore, we should have a surplus in reserve at home to meet a sudden emergency in India. As regards this point, I can only say that the Indian authorities are the best judges of their own requirements, and if they consider the present force inadequate to their requirements it is for them to ask for it. As they have not asked,

The Earl of Portsmouth.

I think it is reasonable to conclude that they are satisfied with the present condition of things.

Before I leave the question of the artillery I think I ought to say that our proposals have been worked out by, and have the entire approval of, Sir F. Stopford and the best artillery experts, and for their untiring services I wish to take this opportunity of expressing the heartiest thanks of the Army Council.

LORD SALTOUN: Sir F. Stopford is a Guardsman. He is not an artilleryman and never was.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: And now to turn to the reduction of Line battalions. We have selected for reduction those battalions that were inefficient in point of strength, viz., 3rd and 4th Northumberland Fusiliers, 3rd and 4th Warwickshire Regiment, 3rd and 4th Lancashire Fusiliers, and 3rd and 4th Manchester Regiment. As I have just said, these regiments were selected in consequence of the difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of recruits for the last few years. The total deficiencies of each regiment are as follows:—Northumberland Fusiliers, six officers and 449 in other ranks; Royal Warwickshire, four officers and 437 in other ranks; Lancashire Fusiliers, six officers and 518 in other ranks; and Manchester Regiment, 542 rank and file.

We have been in constant communication with the Defence Committee, and in co-operation with them we have decided that our present requirements of Line infantry for India must remain at fifty-two. For the Colonies not more than twenty-five as against thirty-two at present. We take two from Malta, one from Gibraltar, one from Ceylon; in these cases because they are regarded as naval stations. We take three from South Africa. In this case we at once replace one of those taken away by a cavalry regiment which is surplus to any other requirements of our cavalry, and which, being a more mobile force, we consider to be better adapted to the needs of the country. I may say parenthetically that if circumstances render it necessary we shall be in a position to add a second cavalry regiment for South Africa. Then in compensation for the other two Line battalions we take away we augment the actual strength of the ten we leave there to 840. We lessen the number of units but we increase their strength, and we do that with the full approval of our military advisers. I now come to the home Line battalions. At present they number seventy-nine; we only require seventy-one as the result of our reorganisation of the forces abroad. This makes our reduction in Line battalions from 156 to 148.

But there is another aspect of the reduction of these battalions, which may have escaped your Lordships' attention. I refer to the question of officers. More than once in your Lordships' House attention has been drawn to the serious shortage of officers in most of the branches of the Regular Army. More than one noble Lord has warned us that we cannot improvise leaders, and that our soldiers are helpless unless they have leaders, and efficient leaders. In that opinion I entirely concur. The Army Council appreciate the gravity of the present situation and are considering it with a view to a remedy. I can further say, on behalf of the Council, that every effort will be made to utilise the services of those officers who are displaced by the reduction of battalions. It is not in our power to transfer officers compulsorily from one regiment to another, but, so far as we possibly can, we shall induce the redundant to accept transfer. If we succeed—and we no not despair of success—other regiments will have a better chance of securing their proper establishment of officers; each unit will have a better complement of leaders, a change which cannot fail to have its effect not only on the efficiency of the soldier but of the officer too. The nearer the strength approximates to the establishment of officers and men, the better prepared for peace training the unit is, and therefore the more likely to attain the proper stage of fighting efficiency.

I now come to the question of the Guards. The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, when he occupied the position of Secretary of State for War in February, 1897, in order to justify the increase of the Guards, used these words—

> "It must, however, be clearly understood that we are able to recommend this increase, and to justify the expenditure which it involves, only upon condition that we are allowed to make use of the brigade to help us in overcoming our difficulties, and to require from it a reasonable contribution towards the relief of the present strain on the Army system."

But this purpose was never fulfilled, and the strengthening of the Guards has been used for an entirely different purpose—namely, for making a brigade of Guards at Aldershot. The Government are perfectly clear that there is not sufficient justification for the annual expenditure of £120,000 a year which these two extra battalions entailed. They are not required for the expeditionary force; and they have no share in that other great duty of the Army at home—the providing of drafts for the forces that garrison the outposts of the Empire. The argument has been put forward for their retention that they are a very cheap force. But, valued by their functions in the general organisa- of the Army, they are by no means cheap. In time of peace a Guardsman costs £4 a year more than a Linesman.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Does that include the cost of the Reserve, or only the cost of a man while he is with the Colours?

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: It is the average sum. Then we are asked why we selected these two particular battalions. Excepting the Irish Guards, they are the two battalions of most recent origin, but lack of antiquity in the Irish Guards is more than compensated for by their actual strength. The Irish Guards number 792 rank and file over twenty years and 430 Reservists. The strength of the 3rd Battalion of Coldstream Guards is only 538 rank and file, and the 3rd Scots Guards 533. I cannot give the number of Reservists.

Much of the objection taken to the reduction of these two battalions has been based on considerations of sentiment, and it is said that the Irish Guards, being more recent, should be sacrificed first. But the question of sentiment has not been overlooked. The battalion was created during the progress of the South African war in appreciation of the services rendered by Irish regiments of the Line, and because the English and Scottish each had their Guards. When reductions of the Army became inevitable, the Secretary of State thought it would not be fair to confine the reductions to regiments of the Line, and he was forced to the conclusion that these two battalions could best be spared.

The recruiting for the Coldstream Guards and Scots Guards will not be stopped at once, but the physical standard will be raised. All men leaving will be either absorbed in other battalions of their own regiment or by their own free-will into other regiments, or they can be passed prematurely, if they so desire, into the Reserve. Officers will be given full pay until re-employed by absorption. As regards the reduction of the Militia, I cannot speak definitely until the War Office Committee appointed to consider the reorganisation of the Militia has reported. As regards the liability of the Militiamen for foreign service, it is our intention to place that liability upon the Militia infantryman and the Militia artilleryman subject to certain conditions, but those conditions will have to be fully considered when legislation for this purpose is proposed. My noble friend Lord Donoughmore was puzzled to know who would be responsible for this Bill when it came before your Lordships' House, and I confess I was somewhat surprised when he quoted me as having taken part in a debate and a division in which I did not take any part at all.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Your name is down as voting.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I am sure it is not, for I have sent for *Hansard*.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Well, it is in my copy of *Hansard*.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I can assure the noble Earl that the Government's Militia Bill will deal with the whole Question and will not be piecemeal legislation.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: When is the Report of the Committee to which the noble Earl has referred likely to be issued?

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I am afraid I am unable to give the noble Marquess an answer, but I can assure him that there will be no delay. I must now thank your Lordships for your kind attention. I have endeavoured to explain what the proposals of the Government are. I trust I may at least have removed certain misapprehensions which have been prevalent. I can only in conclusion assure your Lordships that these proposals have received the most careful, full, and I may say anxious consideration, having regard not to one aspect only, but to the practical exigencies of the whole situation, and I am authorised by the Secretary of State and the civil members of the Council to say that we have obtained for their acceptance not only the loyal assistance, but the loyal support of our distinguished military advisers.

*VISCOUNT HARDINGE: My Lords, as a Militia commanding officer, I wish to associate myself with all that has been said by my noble friend the Duke of Bedford, who, as no doubt many of your Lordships are aware, is looked upon as the great defender of the interests of the Militia. I venture to assert that what the noble Duke has said this afternoon with regard to the needs and the requirements of the Militia is the opinion of ninety-nine Militiamen out of every 100. Although I do not wish to introduce anything of a Party nature into this debate, for I am fully aware that in this House the Army is never looked upon as a Party question, I must admit, nevertheless, that I am somewhat in agreement with my noble friend Lord Newton, who said in this House recently that, although everyone was pointing his finger at the new Secretary of State for War as the one man to whom we could look to create the Army that we require, when he had evolved his scheme this paragon, as Lord Newton described him, would become as unpopular as his predecessor. I must say that I feel somewhat sorry for the right hon. Gentleman, because ever since he has produced his scheme he has been, as I might describe it, fairly riddled with the expanding bullets of criticism, more especially by the two late Secretaries of State for War, Mr. Arnold-Forster and Mr. Brodrick. The majority of your Lordships' House must realise that the present Minister is in a far more parlous condition than either of his predecessors was. I say that for this reason—I think a very cogent reason—the present Minister is able to find neither officers nor men for the Regular or the Auxiliary Forces of the Army that he requires, and he is given very little money for the purpose. I feel sure that we all appreciate, and I know there are many noble Lords in your Lordships' House who are associated with different branches of His Majesty's forces who will appreciate, the greatness of the task that is being imposed upon the Secretary of State for War in what we believe to be his honest and most sincere endeavour to put our Imperial forces into the highest state of efficiency. But we cannot fail to realise that no man can make bricks without straw, a task which I venture to think is a fair analogy of the unfortunate position of the present Secretary of State for War.

We are told at the present time that the order to be given is: "Reduction all round"; and that is to be effected by a process of jugglery, in spite of the fact that the noble and gallant Earl the late Commander-in-Chief has spoken throughout the country in no measured terms, saying that the present Army is totally inadequate for the vital necessities of our Empire, which was not created and cannot be maintained by sea power alone. From this we see that the noble Earl at least is not in sympathy with the theories of the blue-water school, which no doubt is a very useful policy to preach and to adopt when the word of command given is: "General retrenchment all round." But the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War must of necessity turn to his military advisers for advice, and ask them by what process of manipulation this mandate is to be carried out. The Army Council, ever ready to accommodate the right hon. Gentleman, turns, as of old, to the Militia, that old Cinderella of the War Office, saying at the same time that this is the force you will have to work upon, and in order to do it you must by some means induce the Militia to enlist for service beyond the seas in time of emergency, so that in the event of war they will be available for drafts for the Line battalions, and the Militia infantry as ammunition columns for the artillery. I would like to know from my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War whether I have represented correctly the new function of the Militia, which I think is indicated in the speech of the Secretary of State for War. If so, how does he reconcile it with his statement in which he expressed the opinion a few months ago in this House that the intention and wish of His Majesty's Government was to raise both the *status* and the position of the Militia, and also in the same speech when he said—

> "We do not desire that the Militia should be absorbed into the Regular Army, but we are anxious that they should, both by their organisation and by their training, be prepared to take the field as self-contained units."

If, however, I have misread the scheme, and thereby misrepresented the future function of the Militia, I would ask the noble Earl if he can inform us whether this is the case or not. I should also like some information with regard to the present great dearth of officers in the Militia. He has already spoken about the dearth of officers in the Line, but what we in the Militia want to know, is how the great dearth of Militia officers is to be surmounted. No mention of it can I find in the speech of the Secretary of State for War. I am sure that we who are connected or have been connected with the Militia must realise that that is the greatest military problem of the present time that the Army Council has to solve, if the Militia is to remain in being. Unless this difficulty is surmounted at once, the Militia must cease to exist altogether. Most Militia commanding officers are in agreement with the Duke of Bedford and myself that if it is thought necessary to enlist the Militia for service beyond the seas in time of war, the only solution is that they go to the seat of war under their own officers in their own units—and in our opinion in the Militia that unit should be the battalion. If that is conceded to the Militia and the officers commanding the Militia are given a free hand as to their recruiting, we do not think there will be any difficulty in getting officers or men, so that we may resuscitate that force into its former position. If, however, the War Office intend to treat the Militia in the future as they have done in the past—that is to subject them to the process which has been so aptly described by the Secretary of State for War as "bleeding the Militia white" in order to supply the Army with its fighting strength in time of war, the result cannot fail to be to deprive the Militia of all *esprit de corps*, and thereby render its future existence as a force valueless to the Army and useless to the country. If this is to be understood to be the policy of the Government, there will be some truth in the assertion that was made by the military correspondent of *The Times* the other day—that if it is true that the Army is to be reduced by 42,000 men, with no confessed numbers as regards the Militia, then the defenders of the voluntary system will soon be driven out of their last ditch, and the word will go round that it is time for this comedy to finish.

*THE EARL OF MEATH: As I am not a professional soldier and have only served His Majesty for several years as an officer in the auxiliary forces, I should not have ventured to intrude upon your Lordships upon such a subject as this, were it not that for many years—indeed since before the Boer War—I have taken a leading and active part in a movement which is known to many of your Lordships—that is the movement for the training in military exercises, and in the use of the rifle, of all British lads. I desire to make my humble, but most earnest, protest against a reduction in our military forces at a moment when there is unrest in Egypt and danger of trouble in South Africa. It appears to me that this is not a time in which we can afford to lose a single trained man. If the nation had been trained in the past as I hope it will be in the future, perhaps it might be possible to reduce the Regular Army, although I much doubt it. But that has not been done, and as far as I can perceive, His Majesty's Government do not intend, at present at all events, to follow the lines, which I will not say approve themselves to me, because my opinion is worth nothing, but the lines which have met with the approval of the greatest military genius this country has produced since the days of the Conqueror of Napoleon. For years I have ventured to appeal to the country to put our forces upon the real and only solid basis—that is the training of the youth in military matters during the educative period of their lives. These views have met with the approval not only of the eminent Field-Marshal who has just addressed you, but I may say, and I defy contradiction, that they have met with the approval of all the most eminent military men that this country knows. Not only that, but they have met with the approval of a Royal Commission and of a Departmental Committee. The Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration of 1904 spoke most emphatically not only in regard to the physical advantage which such a system would confer, but also as to the military result which would be attained. We have not the recorded support of the majority Report, but that of a very influential minority, of the Royal Commission on the War in South Africa in 1903, in which Sir George Taubman-Goldie and Lord Esher and other eminent members declared themselves most emphatically as regards the necessity of training our lads in military exercises. I think I may say also that this principle has quite recently—so recently as last Saturday—met with a certain amount of approval at the hands of the Secretary of State for War in a speech which he made at Newlands Corner. What did Mr. Haldane say upon that occasion? He said, "They"—I presume he meant His Majesty's Government—

"They wanted the people to be willing to take upon themselves their share of the burden of national defence."

Now, my Lords, that is what the Lads Drill Association and the National Service League have been hammering away at for years and years. Now we have the Secretary of State for War making that statement, and why he does not come and join us after such a declaration I do not know. He said—

"They wanted the people to be willing to take upon themselves their share of the burden of national defence."

Is he going to support those words by any action? That is what we want to know. He said also—

"He hoped that the time would come when we should give up the use of the expression 'Auxiliary Forces' altogether, and speak of th National Army."

Well, my Lords, that is what we want. What we want is that we should have a national Army, and if only Mr Haldane will be true to his words this country will be placed out of danger. He further said—

"They could have in those rifle clubs, as they saw that day"—

(he was addressing a rifle club in Surrey)—

"a most powerful element in the defence of these islands, if only people would recognise that with the rifle clubs, just as much as with the rest of the forces, they needed organisation."

This, again, is what those two associations which I have just mentioned have been hammering away at, and I cannot conceive that we could have a better advocate than Mr. Haldane. These are admirable words, but we do not want only words. We have heard upon other subjects words, words, words from His Majesty's Government, and not always have those words been carried into action. I hope that in this instance at all events His Majesty's Government will adhere to those words, and that we may look to them for assistance towards achieving this desirable end which Mr. Haldane himself has approved. The Secretary of State for War added also that—

"They should not leave things to chance, but should prepare themselves and put themselves in such a position that the national defence would be in a stronger situation than it had been for a good many years past. He trusted that they were at the beginning of things, and in the attack he saw led by trained Volunteers that day, and in the defence organised by less trained rifle corps, who still represented the spirit of the people—and the spirit of the people with organisation to a definite end—it seemed to him that they had the lines upon which they would solve the national problem."

Now if Mr. Haldane will only carry his words into practical effect the national problem will be solved. These are the lines upon which the Lads' Drill Association, and, as I understand it, the National Service League have been acting for years. Will Mr. Haldane give his assistance, and actually do in acts what he has promised in words? He has an example before him. When on former occasions I called your Lordships' attention to the subject of the training of lads to arms I was told that it was a new idea, and when it was no longer possible to say that it was a new idea, I was told that the cost would be so great that it was perfectly impossible for such a country as this to stand it. But Mr. Haldane has examples before him in all the British Colonies—every one of them—but more especially in New Zealand. What has the State of New Zealand done in regard to the training of its lads? The people of New Zealand only recognised the necessity for the training of their lads in the year 1902. In that year they were able to have some 4,000 trained cadets. Now, under the fostering care of that eminent statesman whom we have recently lost—the late Mr. Seddon, who was a firm believer in this idea — those 4,000 cadets have become 14,000, all trained; that is to say, 75 per cent. of the available lads. I should like your Lordships to remember that no compulsion as regards military training is insisted upon by the New Zealand Government. But now comes the point—and I hope the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War will mark this—there is no compulsion as regards military training, but there are *facilities*. That is the point. The New Zealand Government give facilities. What are those facilities? First of all, I should say that there is compulsion as far as physical, and what is called disciplinary training are concerned. Disciplinary training covers a good deal, I may say. They do not call it military, although there is a good deal of military training in it. But there is no compulsion as regards military training and rifle shooting. The New Zealand Act says that in public schools provision shall be made for the instruction in military drill of all boys; that means that whereas physical drill is compulsory, the legislature have wisely made military drill purely voluntary, thus avoiding even the faintest suggestion of that word which the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War seems so fond of—namely, conscription. May I venture strongly to recommend this system to the notice of the Secretary of State for War, through the Under-Secretary who sits in this House? I would like to point out that the way they have obtained those 14,000 lads is as follows. When twelve boys in any school, with the consent of their parents and of the headmaster, desire to be enrolled as cadets, application is made to the Education Department, and not to the War Office. That is a most important point, because we do not want our lads to have anything to say to the Military Office. Let them be under the Education Department, which means that they will be taught by their own schoolmasters and in their own schools, and they will have nothing to say to the Military Department at all. Then the facilities that the Government give are as follows: they give training; that is to say, drill and shooting; they give a grant of 2s. 6d. per boy per annum; they give dummy rifles; they also give one rifle per ten boys, and sixty cartridges. They give a grant of 3s. 6d. per week for any boy who goes into camp, and they give a badge for any boy who has learnt Army signalling. What is the cost of all this? It is trifling. For the first year the cost is about 10s. per boy, and for other years 3s. 6d. If New Zealand can produce 14,000 trained lads, it is simply a matter of calculation by rule of three to make out that we ought to be able to produce about 600,000. If the whole of our lads, or the great proportion of them, were thus trained to arms, we should be exempt from these undignified and dangerous changes of policy that bring the Empire into contempt, endanger the State, and encourage our enemies to attack us.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, as I happen to be one of the few members of your Lordships' House who have served some years in the Royal Artillery, and as the question of the Royal Artillery plays a very prominent part in the scheme which has been submitted to Parliament by the Secretary of State for War, I would ask the indulgence of the House for the purpose of submitting a few remarks with regard to that branch of the service. I cannot help thinking that although the Under-Secretary of State may claim to have a mandate for the reduction of expenses, and in consequence of that for a reduction of the men in the Army in general, I cannot, and I absolutely decline to, accept his dictum that the people of this country fully realise what is meant when they demand a reduction, and thereby a weakening, of the Royal Artillery of the Army. The Artillery of recent years—certainly within the last twenty years—has suffered very considerably by being what is colloquially known in the regiment as "messed about" by successive Governments and successive propounders of Army schemes. They have been reduced in numbers, and they have been increased in numbers, and although I sit on this side of the House I do not hesitate to say that one of the most fatal mistakes that was ever made in regard to the Royal artillery was the action taken by the Secretary of State for War, Mr. Edward Stanhope, when, by a few strokes of the pen, he wiped out certain batteries of artillery for the purpose of acceding to the cry of economy which was raised then, just as it is being raised now by certain people who do not really apprehend the innermost parts of the question. That mistake was afterwards realised, and then it was that the people began to appreciate the fact that although it may be an easy matter to strike out a battery of artillery by a stroke of the pen, it is a very different matter to build it up, and to produce the highly trained men who are absolutely necessary for the modern artillery of an army.

It is well known now, I think, that at the beginning of the South African War, and in fact for some time previously, the artillery of the British Army had been allowed to get into a most dangerously weak state, and that the party represented by noble Lords opposite, when they were last in power, and when the present Prime Minister was Secretary of State for War, left the Royal Artillery in a most deplorably weak state. I do not think that the country, in many of its most uncalled for criticisms on the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition in this House for the action which he took when he was at the War Office at the beginning of the South African War, ever realised the part which my noble friend took in strengthening the artillery, or the foresight which he displayed when he first took over the administration of the War Office, or the action which he took in at once doing all that he possibly could to make up the lamentable deficiency which existed in the field guns of the Army. I know for a fact that the authorities of the War Office were very greatly concerned at the lamentable shortness of guns in our Army. About that time I happened to take over the command of the old Volunteer regiment which I now command. It was then armed with 9-pounder field guns, which would be about as useful as popguns in modern warfare. I did not lose much time in representing to the War Office and to the authorities that it was a monstrous waste of the taxpayers' money to give us capitation grants for the purpose of instructing our men in the use of those guns, and that it was simply a waste of time to ask zealous Volunteers to give up their leisure for the purpose of drilling with those guns, which could be of no possible use in warfare when opposed to the guns which exist among European Powers. The only reason that I was not provided on the spot with better guns was that they did not exist. I remember well that I was rather importunate at the time, and that at last the Field Marshal who was then at the War Office (Lord Wolseley) sent for me, and I went up to his private room, where he said to me—

> "Look here; we should be only too pleased to give you proper guns to drill with, but the long and short of it is that we have not got enough for the regular Army,"

and then he said—

> "But for God's sake don't go and say so outside."

I did not say so outside, because I knew there was no good to be done by saying anything about it; but I know that the noble Marquess and the Government of the day were doing their very best to remedy the deficiency in artillery, and that guns had been ordered from the private firms of the country, and were being made as fast as they could be turned out. I merely refer to this fact for the purpose of showing to what extent the Royal Artillery has suffered by mistakes in the past.

I fear it would be a most deplorable mistake at the present moment to revert to that principle of economy at the expense of the artillery, because everybody nowadays, I think, is beginning to realise the absolute necessity of a first-class artillery to any modern Army. There is a very zealous body in this country known as the Navy League, and they have done a great deal of good in the way of bringing the details of Navy work before the people of the country, and one of the functions which they have performed has been that of conducting periodical expeditions of zealous citizens down to Portsmouth, where they have taken them round the dockyard and the various important ships which happened to be there, for the purpose of showing them the various details of Navy work, and letting them understand the differences between a battleship, a cruiser, and a torpedo-boat—details of which unfortunately the British public in the past have been too ignorant. When one realises the ignorance which prevails, not only amongst the British public but amongst members of the House of Commons and amongst politicians, and I daresay even amongst many of the members of your Lordships' House, but especially amongst members of the British public who cry out in a rather short-sighted way for economy at no matter what expense, I often wish that something could be done with a view to imitating the Navy League, and instituting an Artillery League for the purpose of organising personally-conducted expeditions down to our artillery camps at Okehampton and Salisbury Plain, and letting the people see for themselves what are the details of artillery training, how technical and how important the work is, and how impossible it is to turn out ready-made artillerymen who would be of any use at all at short notice.

Now, my Lords, one of the chief lessons of the recent great war between Russia and Japan—a lesson which has been brought home to soldiers all over the world more than anything else—has been the great part played by artillery in modern warfare, the enormous advantage which the side with the best artillery has, and how absolutely necessary it is to have the best possible artillery if you want to win a modern battle. When I talk of the best artillery, I do not mean merely the Artillery armed with the best gun, the gun which can fire most shots in a given space of time, the gun with the longest range, or the gun which is the most accurate, but I mean also the artillery which is served by the best trained men. It is well recognised amongst artillery officers at the present moment that the better the gun you have, the better the men you must have behind it. We at the present moment are arming our Artillery with a new complicated gun—an excellent gun, and one which we believe to be superior to that possessed by any foreign country—and I maintain that it is nothing short of the most fatuous policy to embark at the present moment on any scheme of economy which has the effect of reducing the value of the training of the personnel of our artillery, for that training is wanted more than ever it was for the purpose of dealing with these new guns. I would remind your Lordships that the greater the facilities are for rapid firing in the field, the greater are the facilities for wasting ammunition and the more necessity exists for having thoroughly trained and disciplined men who can be trusted to make the most use of every shell they carry in their ammunition columns, and who can be depended upon not to go on firing away their ammunition at a time when it will not give the best possible results, with the probability of finding a short time afterwards when they want ammunition that they are running short of it.

One of the most critical and difficult tasks which field artillery nowadays has to perform in warfare is that of supporting the infantry in an attack up to the last possible moment. All the experience gained in the recent war between the Russians and the Japanese goes to prove the hopelessness of infantry attempting to attack a strongly fortified position, defended by men armed with modern rifles and modern machine guns, with the position obstructed and defended by all the devices of modern military engineering, unless they can be supported up to the very last moment of the attack by an accurate and heavy artillery fire. Now, my Lords, you can get a heavy artillery fire from anybody. Anybody can let off a gun. But you cannot get an accurate artillery fire except from very highly trained men, and more especially nowadays when artillery practice has to be conducted from what is known as under cover, very often from the reverse side of a hill, when you cannot see your target at all, and you have to lay your guns by a complicated system of artillery marks and to exercise the greatest possible accuracy. It is one of the most important and critical duties which artillery has to perform, and I would only ask noble Lords opposite to attempt to realise the feelings of infantry, who, after losing a large number of men in attacking a position, get near the top, and then suddenly find that their own artillery which hitherto has been supporting them is getting erratic and is dropping shells amongst them instead of confining them to the enemy. There is nothing more demoralising to troops. Supposing a general were at the last moment compelled to bring up some artillery on which he could not thoroughly depend, and had to turn them on to assist in the overwhelming fire which has to be poured on to an enemy's trenches at the last moment of an attack, and suppose he realised that owing to the faulty training of the artillery their fire was not as accurate as it should be. I can imagine his feelings and also the feelings of the infantry making the attack. Anybody who brought up half-trained artillery to participate in an operation of that sort would be running a most dangerous risk of spoiling the whole of the attack at the last moment, of demoralising his own troops, and of sustaining a very great disaster—all because these men had not been sufficiently trained beforehand.

I must say that I heard with a great amount of relief, if I understood the Under-Secretary of State aright, that there was no intention of reducing the present artillery until the War Office had got a sufficient number of trained Militiamen ready to go abroad to take the places of the men it is intended to reduce. We must be thankful for small mercies, and that is something to the good. I presume that the weighty arguments which have appeared in the Press since the scheme was first made public have had some effect upon the noble Earl and his colleagues at the War Office, and that they are beginning to realise that these reductions cannot be as immediate as was at first thought. At the same time, the action which the Government are proposing to take with regard to the Royal Artillery cannot have any other effect than that of depreciating the value of the personnel, because no matter how zealous these Militiamen who are to be brought in to take the place of trained artillerymen may be, they cannot possibly be as good, or as serviceable in the field. I maintain that you are incurring very grave danger by reducing a large number of batteries to the two-gun strength, which batteries cannot possibly be trained properly during peace time, and which when mobilised for war and made up to strength with all these Militiamen and Reservemen cannot possibly be compared in the field with artillery that has been properly kept up during peace time, and properly trained.

Therefore, my Lords, on the general score of the importance of thoroughly trained artillery for the purposes of modern warfare, I deprecate in the strongest way any tampering with the Royal Artillery at the present moment for the purposes of this economy which we are told was one of the mandates of the last General Election. I do not believe that the people of this country, if they thoroughly understood the technicalities of artillery work, the importance of artillerymen in the field, and the absolute necessity for trained artillery in action, would lend their support to or would encourage the present Administration in the execution of what they are pleased to call a mandate. The noble Earl said that out of ninety-nine batteries which exist at home, or will exist at home when six are brought from South Africa, it would be possible to mobilise only some forty-two. I have not had an opportunity of checking the figures, but if the noble Earl says so——

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I do not want to interrupt, but I think I said ninety-three, not ninety-nine batteries. I think there are six coming home from South Africa.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I said that when they came home from South Africa the number would be ninety-nine. At all events, out of these batteries it would be possible to mobilise only forty-two.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): I think the noble Earl is wrong there. Under the arrangements of the late Government, it would be possible to mobilise only forty-two. Under the arrangement we propose sixty-three will be ready to go out with the expeditionary force.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: That is it.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I understood the Under-Secretary of State for War to read out to your Lordships a Minute which had been passed by the Army Council in which some proposal was made very much corresponding to the scheme of the Government for utilising the Militia. I do not question for a moment that there are many men amongst the ranks of those mobilised for service with the artillery whom it is not necessary to regard as highly-trained men, and that the duties of those men could very likely be very well performed by the Militia whom it is proposed to bring in. But what I object to is the proposal to reduce such a large number of our service batteries to four-gun batteries, thereby reducing the number of trained men whom it would be possible to put into the field, and also to reduce a very large number of other batteries to two-gun batteries. Although you may make up the number of heads by bringing in Militiamen, I distinctly maintain that you are weakening the artillery of the Army by substituting half-trained or imperfectly trained Militiamen for a certain number of highly trained artillerymen.

Then the Secretary of State, so far as I can understand his scheme, is using up practically the whole of his service batteries for his expeditionary force, and the only batteries which will be left in the country will be, I think, thirty-six, some of them four-gun batteries and some two-gun.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Eighteen four-gun batteries, and eighteen two-gun.

THE EARL of DENBIGH: These would be your reserve. You cannot lay down any axiom as to when they will be called upon. You may want to send out the reinforcements to the artillery very soon after the commencement of hostilities. Supposing there is a serious reverse, you lose a considerable number of guns and you have to send out reinforcements at once; you cannot wait for the purpose of training these men; you cannot ask the enemy to be good enough to wait until you have turned your Militiamen into highly trained men. You will have to send out your half-trained men for the purpose of working a most complicated quick-firing gun. As I said before, the better the gun, the better the men you must have behind it, and it is a most dangerous thing to have absolutely no proper reserve in this country for the purpose of reinforcing your first line of artillery.

Then, my Lords, there is another point. We pride ourselves upon our Imperial forces; we speak of how the Colonies are going to come to the assistance of the Mother country in time of stress and danger. I have no doubt they would, but I submit to your Lordships that if the time should unhappily come when we found it necessary to call upon the Colonies for assistance, they would not send us any trained artillery—they have not got them. They might send us a battery or two from Canada; there was a battery of artillery in Durban; we might perhaps get one from Australia, but you would get no artillery worth speaking about. You would get plenty of mounted infantry, and plenty of infantry, but where are you going to find the proportion of artillery to make up the number of guns which would be wanted for use with these Colonial troops? I submit that it is a most short-sighted policy to go on hugging yourselves with the idea that you are going to be assisted in time of danger by the Colonies and our various dominions beyond the seas, while you are making absolutely no proper provision for the purpose of supplying those troops with their proportion of artillery. You are making no provision at all for artillery for colonial troops; you are reducing to a dangerously low pitch the batteries which remain over and above your expeditionary force; you are providing absolutely no drafts for the purpose of reinforcing your first line of artillery in the event of disaster. And as one who may claim to have some knowledge of what artillery work is ,of how difficult it is to train a modern artilleryman, and of how absolutely necessary it is if you are to have an efficient Army to have artillerymen of the best possible description, I wish to enter the strongest protest I can against any proposals of the Government which would have the effect of weakening the artillery of this country.

I should like to refer briefly to one remark which fell from the noble Earl. He said that when they realised that they had from the country this mandate to cut down expenses, they came to a solemn resolve to cut down all that made for show, and to keep only that which was absolutely necessary. Surely the noble Earl is not so ignorant of artillery work as to think that the artillery of the British Army is kept for show! Are the Government cutting down the strength of these batteries because they think they are kept for show? The Secretary of State and the Under-Secretary would not hold that opinion if they were in the position of infantry officers taking part in an attack on a dangerous position, being covered by artillery fire, and suddenly finding the shells falling very erratically because fired by one of those half-trained batteries which had been put in for the purpose of replacing those which had previously been "kept for show." Anybody who looks at this question from the point of view of the absolute necessities of the Army must agree with what I have ventured to put before your Lordships. Do what you can to effect economies in the administration of the Army, but do not do anything at the present juncture of affairs which would have the effect of weakening the artillery, which is an absolute necessity for modern warfare.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I sympathise with a great deal that has been said by the noble Earl opposite, and I can assure him that the very last thing which His Majesty's Government intend to do is to weaken the artillery of the Army. No doubt the noble Earl will admit that the artillery of the British Army had in recent years fallen to a very low ebb, but it has been enormously improved. We have a very good pattern of gun, and we have a very quick-firing gun, and there is no intention whatever in the scheme of my right hon. friend Mr. Haldane of making the artillery of which we are now in possession useless instead of its being a strength to the British Army.

Now, my Lords, the state of affairs was described perfectly correctly by the noble Earl. The proposal is that there should be sixty-three batteries kept at full strength to go with the expeditionary force, and six batteries are to be brought back from South Africa, which with the others here will make up the thirty-six in reserve. Of those thirty-six, eighteen will be kept with four guns, and eighteen with two. But that does not mean that those batteries will not have the other two guns ready in reserve; it simply means that two guns only will be used for the purpose of training the particular men to whom those batteries are entrusted. Lord Denbigh very justly dwelt on the great necessity of trained men to use modern guns. In my old days I knew something about small guns, and since I went to the Admiralty I have been trying to learn something about big guns, guns even bigger than those to which the noble Earl refers. But, my Lords, it becomes more and more patent that it is absolutely necessary for the service of modern artillery that you should have the most highly trained men to use the guns and to fire them, but, as is the case in the Navy, whilst you want a certain number of very highly trained men, men of really scientific attainments, to use the guns with proper and thorough effect, you want also, on account of the great rapidity of modern firing, an enormous amount of ammunition and a great many people to bring that ammunition up, and to act for the purpose not of firing the guns, or of getting good results from the guns, but of keeping the guns supplied with the ammunition which is necessary, and of keeping up communications with the reserve ammunition parts in the rear. The War Office think that it is very necessary to secure a good supply of these men. There is no intention whatever of handing over the absolute working of the guns to untrained or partly trained men, but there is the intention of utilising less-trained men exactly as we are now doing in the Navy to bring up the ammunition and to do work of that description.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: The noble Lord will forgive me for pointing out that although it may be possible to use untrained men to bring up ammunition, you must always rely on having a considerable number of trained men for the purpose of replacing casualties at the front.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Certainly; I do not dispute that at all; but you equally require less-trained men to take the places of those who suffer casualties in bringing up ammunition to the front. After all, only a certain number of men can carry out the work of actually firing the guns.

I have listened, my Lords, to this debate with a great deal of interest, and it seems to me that we have as usual developed two schools in this House. I am very glad to think that the noble Earl who originated this debate and myself are agreed at any rate as to the foundation on which our Army should be based. He said most frankly that he was entirely against conscription. He said that he did not believe that the British nation would ground its military organisation on conscription, and that it was not necessary that it should do so. I thoroughly agree with the noble Earl in that view. But I must say that most of the other speakers to-night, so far, have grounded their views entirely on the opposite opinion. The noble Earl, Earl Roberts, it is quite true, attempted to divide his case, and to say that voluntary service was necessary only for foreign operations, and compulsory service for home defence. Well, my Lords, in that speech, and in other speeches which have been delivered to-night, I think there has been a considerable mistake made. There has been throughout a tendency to compare the position of this country with that of the great military Powers of the Continent. But that is where the great difference comes in. The noble Earl, Earl Roberts, talked about there being 5,000,000 men ready to come to the front in Germany, with another 10,000,000 somewhere behind them. We cannot compete with that, nor do we rest our safety on our army. The position of our foreign neighbours and possible enemies is this: they put their strength in their army plus a navy; we on the other hand, put our strength in a navy plus an army. That is a totally different state of things, and I maintain that it is absolutely impossible that any country could be able to keep up both a navy and an army on the scale on which modern armaments are founded. The German or the Frenchman or the Austrian or the Russian has to defend a great frontier by land against his neighbours, but we have nothing of that sort to do. What we have to do is to defend our own Islands, our own Colonies, and our own Dependencies, which themselves are surrounded by the sea, and from which we can drive our enemies by our power on the sea. ["India."] As to India, in the first place, you have the Himalayas as your frontier, and you have also a very considerable Indian Army. I will come to the land defences of India presently, but I think we have a considerable power of defence in India from the sea also. But my contention is that our military operations for the most part are military operations beyond our shores, outside these islands, and for that purpose conscription is not only impossible, but against all precedent and against all common reason. For defence at home we have to rely, in the first place, upon the sea itself, and upon our power on the sea, and, secondly, on the voluntary effort of the citizens of this country.

I think, my Lords, that most of us are agreed that with regard to the defence services, three things are necessary: economy, sufficiency of defence, and efficiency. I do not think that we can be accused of excess of economy so far as our defence services are concerned. We spend nearly £30,000,000 on the Army, and over £31,000,000 on the Navy, £61,000,000 in all. That is a fairly good allowance, and yet, after all, these £61,000,000 represent a comparatively small part of the total expense of the defence services of the Empire. We cannot forget the amount of expense that is thrown upon India, nor the fact that our Colonies also help. If you take in the works of both Army and Navy, if you take in the charge made on our Indian Empire, you will find that the total cost to the Empire year by year amounts to something like £93,000,000, over £51,000,000 for the Army, and over £41,000,000 for the Navy. These are large sums, and surely of them something may be saved without destroying the efficiency of these two great services.

Then when I come to the sufficiency of strength with regard to the Army, I do not think that that, on paper at any rate, if it were properly organised, is very small or much to be despised. I will take, first, our establishment here. Let me take the regimental establishment of the Army, the Army Reserve, and the Auxiliary Forces, including the British troops in India. Their establishment at this moment is 903, 404; their actual strength is 745,981; and the deficiency is largely due to gaps in the Militia and in the Volunteers. Then you have the Indian Army including Reserves, Military Police, Frontier Levies, Imperial Service Troops, and Volunteers. The establishment in India is 267,647, the actual strength being 260,033. The organised land forces under Colonial Governments amount under both heads to 137,551. That is to say, on our establishment we have a grand total of 1,308,602 men, with an actual strength of 1,143,565. That is not a bad number of men to go upon for our purposes, and it seems to me that if these men can be properly organised and made the best possible use of, we have, at any rate, a very sufficient number of men to rest our strength in.

Then, my Lords, I come to the question of efficiency. We have the Reports of the Elgin Commission and of the Esher Committee, and these, with the action of the last two Secretaries of State for War, Mr. Brodrick and Mr. Arnold-Forster, show clearly that the desired efficiency has not been arrived at. Successive Secretaries of State for War have thought it necessary to take steps to make the forces at our disposal more efficient than they have been, and that is the intention of my right hon. friend Mr. Haldane. He has very frankly and very clearly shown up what the deficiencies in the Army are; I think he has recognised them, especially with regard to the present condition of the Militia and the Volunteers. He has essentially rested himself on the necessity for efficiency for war on the part of our forces. He has not attempted to propose any new type of Army whatever, but has taken things as they are. He has rested his scheme on the Cardwell system, which, in spite of what any may say, has proved itself through these years to be a useful and practical system, a system which has enabled us to keep up our supplies of men, and of arms to the different parts of the Empire that we have to care for. My right hon. friend has most fully acknowledged the excellence of officers and men in His Majesty's present Army. He has not attempted to dispute the energy and training of the officers or what I believe to be the new spirit in the officers which has arisen during the last ten or twelve years and made them better than they ever were before.

There is a great deal of truth in what has been said as to our Army at the present moment being in many respects better than it ever was before. But, my Lords, the difficulty has been that all these various portions of the Army have not been brought together, or worked one in with another. They have been separate one from another, and there has been no common action between them. That is what my right hon. friend wishes to remedy. He desires to group them together, to dovetail the different forces in one with another, to re-organise them, and to make them really powerful for the purposes for which they are intended. Many of the present units are undoubtedly costly, and at the same time they do not fulfil the purposes for which they are intended. The intention of the Secretary of State for War is to supplement these more costly elements in our military service, which would be the more highly trained men, by cheaper units; by men who perhaps are not so highly trained as the others. There are many services now carried out by Regulars which can perfectly well be carried out by less fully trained men. Such work as that connected with the ammunition columns, transport, supply and medical work, can all be done by men raised on what I may call a Militia basis. I believe that re-organisation on these lines is essential, and that for these purposes the Militia on a new scale and under a new system can well be used.

I am inclined to agree with what has been said by the Duke of Bedford and Lord Hardinge to-night. The Militia of the future is not in any sense going to be the Militia of the past. It is going to be an altogether different service. The remark has been made that some of my noble friends last year were against, or seemed to be against the Militia being in the future enlisted for foreign service. My withers are quite unwrung on that particular subject, for speaking in your Lordships' House last year, I expressed my view very strongly that it was a desirable thing, and that moreover it was a fair thing to the Militia itself, because in the past, although it is all very well to say that the Militia were under no compulsion to go abroad, yet as a matter of fact, they were practically compelled to go, or else the regiment or the men would really have lost their character with the whole service. I do not think that that was enlisting men on a fair system at all. The Militia of the future, I should hope, would not be used simply to fill up the Regular Army. I hope they may be—if I may so term it—a sort of half-timers, men who will devote a large portion of their time to civil employment, who for the first year perhaps will give a considerable amount of time to their military training, but in subsequent years give only a shorter time, and instead of the ranks being filled up by mere striplings, without stamina and without physique, I hope they will be drawn from older men who would be of more actual use for service in the field when the time came.

Lord Tweedmouth.

I may perhaps very briefly state what I believe to be the intentions of the Secretary of State for War. He finds himself in this position—that in India 78,000 men are required; that for Egypt and South Africa and other parts of the Dominions beyond the seas he requires another 42,000 men, or 120,000 in all. He has to provide not only those 120,000, but also the yearly drafts. That, under his scheme, he believes he can do perfectly well. Besides that he think that he can provide 154,000 men for an expeditionary force, these 154,000 being made up of 50,000 Regulars with the colours, 70,000 Regular Reservists, and 30, 657 other men made up in this way: 3,240 from the Yeomanry; 10,337 from the Artillery, who should be provided out of the present Militia Garrison Artillery, and the Militia Engineers; 10,775 for the Army Service Corps, from the same source; 3,098 from the Royal Army Medical Corps, 541 for the Army Veterinary Corps, and 441 for the Army Ordnance Corps; making up altogether 30,657 men whom he proposes to draw from this new force on the new Militia basis.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: How many Militia will remain?

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: That depends on how many we get. At the present moment, at any rate, there are 90,000 Militiamen.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: And these are drawn from the Militia?

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: From the new Militia enlisted under the new conditions of service.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: But presumably from the present 90,000?

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I should hope it would be a great many more than 90,000 in the future.

The EARL of DONOUGHMORE: Are they to be added to the Militia first, and taken away afterwards, or are they to be taken from the Militia as they now stand ?

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: In the first instance, they will come from the Militiamen, supposing the present Militiamen take service under the new conditions. The idea is that we are going to form a new Militia which will be the second line of the Army, and be required to do all the work which the Regular Army has to do, though, of course, they will do the less technical and the less difficult portions of that work. My right hon. friend calculates that he can supply further 56,000 men to support that expeditionary force after it is mobilised for the first six months of a war, made up in this way: Infantry Reservists, 25,000; Militia, 9,000; Cavalry Regular Reserve and Yeomanry, 4,581; Artillerymen and Militia, 10,610; Engineers, 1673; Army Service Corps men on a Militia basis, 3,000; and Royal Army Medical Service men, also on a Militia basis, 1,300, making 55,174.

LORD WENLOCK: Did the noble Lord say 4,000 Yeomanry to repair the wastage of war ?

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: In the first category I put down 3,240, and in the second category, Cavalry Regular Reserve and Yeomanry, 4,581.

LORD WENLOCK: Does that include Regular cavalry ?

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Reserves, yes. These then are the rough ideas that my right hon. friend proposes to follow. I quite admit that the success of the scheme rests on the success of his Militia proposals, so far as the expeditionary force is concerned, and its being kept up in a satisfactory way. But then there is the question of the Volunteers. My right hon. friend thinks that a great deal can be done to popularise this force, and to interest the different districts of the country in the Volunteer service. I think most of your Lordships will agree that that is a desirable object, and I believe that upon that force we can depend for great help in time of war.

A question was raised with regard to the garrisons of Gibraltar and Malta. It is perfectly true that considerable reductions are proposed in both those places. These proposals are made largely in consideration of the effects of the changes in modern armaments. So far as Gibraltar is concerned, I do not think I am overstating the case when I say that, supposing Spain were either hostile or in hostile hands, Gibraltar would be practically untenable; it would be commanded by modern artillery in such a way that it would be impossible to defend it from the land. On the other hand, we have got naval interests at Gibraltar; it has become the base of our Atlantic Fleet, and from the sea at any rate we believe we can defend it with the greatest certainty of success. The same thing applies with regard to Malta. The methods of defence by sea have become so various, and have increased so much that we believe that there also we are safe, and that a comparatively small garrison will hold it against any possible raid.

These are our justifications for the proposals made for the reduction of the garrisons in these two places in the Mediterranean, and I may say that the reductions are concurred in by all the the experts, both naval and military. Of course, the Opposition can very fairly say that our proposals are nebulous, that they are not clear. I think that the proposals themselves are clear enough, though I admit that the question as to whether or not they will succeed is not and cannot be clear. We must see to what extent the proposals are taken up by the people themselves, and supported by the country at large. But we ourselves believe that what we are recommending is a policy which is likely to commend itself to the people of the country, and in which they are likely to help us. I think your Lordships will admit that I at any rate have spoken to-night in no party spirit. All I can say is, that His Majesty's Government will be only too glad to get the help of all patriotic men in the Opposition in carrying this great scheme to a successful issue.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, in a previous debate I ventured to predict that the present Secretary of State for War would before long occupy the position of the best or rather the worst abused man in the country, and the course of the debate to-night seems to have justified that prophecy. I also expressed the opinion, which created some surprise at the time, that so far as I personally was concerned, I was unable to ascertain that any material difference existed in principle between the present Secretary of State for War and his immediate predecessors, and that impression also appears to have been corroborated by what has passed during the course of this discussion. And for this reason I was less impressed than I ought to have been by the crushing attack, or what I suppose is considered the crushing attack, delivered by my noble friend Lord Donoughmore on the present Under-Secretary. I am bound to say that if my noble friend Lord Donoughmore occupied himself for hours or even for days and weeks in attacking his successor at the War Office I should still remain of the some opinion; and if Mr. Arnold-Forster and Mr. Brodrick were to fill column after column and page after page of *The Times* in proving how immensely superior in every respect their respective schemes were to the scheme of the present Secretary of State, I am afraid I should remain still unconvinced.

But, at all events, I am prepared to make this concession if it gives my noble friend Lord Donoughmore any satisfaction, that in my humble opinion the present Secretary of State for War is a distinctly more dangerous man than the previous occupants of that office. I do not know why that statement is greeted with derision, but I think I shall be able to prove that I am correct. In the first place, the present Secretary of State for War enjoys the backing of an unprecedented majority. In the second place, and this is very important, he enjoys, most unfortunately in my opinion, the reputation of being a moderate man amongst immoderate colleagues. If we had to do with what I might vulgarly term an "out and outer," a peace-at-any-price antivaccinator, or a man of that kind, our position would be infinitely easier in attacking him; but we have to deal with a man whom we all know to be very clever, and who has a reputation for moderation. The case in attacking him is therefore infinitely more difficult, but I maintain that the difference between the present Secretary of State for War and his immediate predecessors is one of degree. So convinced am I of this fact that if by some extraordinary concatenation of circumstances the present Secretary of State were to be ejected from office and to be replaced by some statesman from this side of the House or from the Opposition side of the other House, I feel absolutely confident that I could predict with the utmost certainty the speech that gentleman would make on assuming office. He would begin by announcing that, owing to the iniquity of his predecessor, the condition of the British Army was eminently unsatisfactory. He would go on to say that he intended to make people feel that they were going to get value for their money. He would add that the British Army was intended for war, and that every expenditure upon that Army which did not conduce to make it effective for war would be a sheer and wicked waste of money. This is a truism which, in the language of the music halls, always "draws," and is perfectly certain to obtain applause. Then probably, in order to display his own cleverness, he would proceed to point out that the problem which confronted us in this country was one of extraordinary and exceptional difficulty, and that he intended to give the nation greater efficiency at less expense—probably 50 per cent. greater efficiency at 50 per cent. less cost. If to these expressions he added that he was a firm believer in the blue water school and referred to what is known as the "silver streak" in sufficiently appreciative terms, and proceeded to hint a promise of inaugurating disarmament, and if he finally wound up with an eloquent denunciation of the grinding tyranny of conscription to which the Swiss, the French, and the other slaves of Republican

Governments submit, he would at all events be sure of a temporary rhetorical success; and if he talked long enough and fluently enough he would probably even be complimented by his predecessor in office.

Well, my Lords, these rhetorical rhapsodies produce in me the reflection that we are not in the least the sort of people we imagine ourselves to be or that other people imagine us to be. We imagine ourselves and we are imagined, quite erroneously, to be an extremely practical people. As a matter of fact, it is perfectly clear to me that we are one of the most emotional and sentimental people on the face of the globe, and if it comes to quantity and quality of gush there is no one who can successfully compete with us. I can understand these eloquent platitudes and truisms exercising considerable influence upon persons who are not in the habit of listening to political speeches. I can imagine them having considerable effect, say, in a gathering promoted by the Liberal Social Union, or even, under certain circumstances, under the auspices of the Primrose League. But it is really astonishing to me to find that these rhetorical outbursts and these platitudes are swallowed by persons who are accustomed to pass their lives in listening either to their own speeches or to those of other persons. You would suppose that the Members of the other House would by this time, to put it vulgarly, know what claptrap is, but, strange to say, they do not.

Stripped of all exuberant rhetoric, what solid facts do we gather from the much-applauded statement of the present Secretary of State for War? The only ascertainable solid dry facts are these—that he is going to reduce the Regular Army and put absolutely nothing in its place, unless eloquent aspirations and hopes are to be taken as the equivalent for solid flesh and blood. If this is the result of clear thinking, I confess that for my part I much prefer obscurity. What we know is that, as regards the Army, the Government have decided upon a reduction, and we also know that the friends and colleagues, or a certain number of them, of the right hon. Gentleman are in favour also of reducing naval expenditure. These reductions are justified by optimists upon the following grounds. To put it briefly, their argument runs as follows. They say we have got an alliance with the Japanese, a simple-minded people who apparently are fond of fighting, and who, although an island race, actually think it necessary to maintain an efficient military force. These people, to whom we have been condescending enough to grant an alliance will guarantee to us our Asiatic Empire. If we look nearer home we have an understanding with France which gives us absolute security in Europe. Domestic dissensions in Russia clearly prevent the possibility of any aggressive action on the part of that Power. The Germans belong to the same family as ourselves. We have lately been entertaining selections of German journalists in this country, and at this moment an International Parliament is sitting in these premises. There is nothing, we are told, to be apprehended from them. As to the prospect of a fratricidal war with America, that is an absolutely unthinkable calamity. In addition to these convincing arguments we have been told by the present Under-Secretary of State for War that if any Power were misguided enough to make an attack upon us the taxable capacity of the community and its financial reserve power would be the best guarantee for defence.

I am prepared cheerfully to admit that the present position of the British Empire is extremely favourable, and very much more favourable than it was some years ago. I would like to ask to what is this due? I should like to pay the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition the compliment of saying that it is entirely due to his own qualities of high statesmanship. It certainly is not due to our own popularity or to any engaging qualities which we may possess in our own eyes or in the eyes of other people. These alliances and understandings are due, not to any idealistic state of things, but to a simple fact—namely, to the fact that we have had sufficient sense persistently to cultivate our sea power and to pay attention to our Navy; and perhaps it is necessary to point out that alliances and understandings are not founded upon sentiment but upon interest. The interest in this particular case happens to be our possession of naval power, and as soon as we begin to neglect that very necessary precaution we shall experience a most remarkable change for the worse in our relations with foreign countries, and the more we increase our military efficiency the greater will be the consideration which we shall enjoy.

The reduction to which I refer may be an act of gross iniquity on the part of the Government. At all events, my noble friend the Under-Secretary for War has fairly let the cat out of the bag to-night with regard to this particular point. He has informed us that this reduction is not the result of military or political calculations, but the result of a mythical mandate given by the voters at the last election. I almost wish that some noble Lord would move for a Return of the various mandates which have been given during the last few months. When he says that this is acquiesced in by the military officers of the Government, I imagine that the position is this, that the Government went to the military experts and said—

> "Now, look here, we have got a mandate, and you have to accommodate yourselves to that mandate. The mandate is that we cut down the offensive forces of the Crown, and you have to make the best of it."

That is the long and short of it. I cannot help thinking that the proposed reduction has been somewhat exaggerated on the present occasion. It seems to me that what we have to make up our minds upon, what we have to decide, is not a mere question whether a few battalions shall be abolished or maintained, especially if some of those battalions happen to be more or less paper battalions. The question which we have to consider is a very much more important one than that—namely, the question which was brought before this House by Lord Roberts and by Lord Milner.

The real task, if the present Secretary of State had been in earnest, was to set about the preparation of this country for war. This, by the way, he professed himself ready to do, but the only sign of it is, to use the expression of the First Lord of the Admiralty, a nebulous scheme under which the Auxiliary Forces are to enjoy home rule and people are to train and organise themselves under the supervision of the local authorities, but not in such a way as to interfere with their own business. If this meant anything at all, which, in all probability, it does not, it would mean that the Auxiliary Forces —the national Army—are to be put upon the rates. At all events, what is clear is that it is intended that the War Office —the central authority—should wash its hands of all responsibility for national defence and the Auxiliary Forces or the national Army, whichever you choose to call it, will be handed over to a hybrid body with the Lord-Lieutenant at the head of it and presumably a labour town councillor, or possibly a passive resister, at the tail. From the enthusiasm with which this proposal has been greeted and from the length of time which has been spent upon it by the Committee under Lord Esher, it might be supposed that this idea of invoking local influences had never been evolved before. How true it is that there is nothing new under the sun! I should like to know where the Auxiliary Forces would be at the present moment if it had not been for the work done by Lords-Lieutenant and county people generally. Yet the present Secretary of State for War, in what I can only term a singularly ungenerous manner, talks of the desirability of Lords-Lieutenant earning their uniforms, and presumably of Deputy-Lieutenants earning their uniforms too, and of giving county people something to do. It is a pity that at this stage of the proceedings we do not know more about the composition of these associations. We know that Lords-Lieutenant are going to be at their head, and we know that Deputy-Lieutenants are also going to be invited to take part. We have reason to suppose that the services of employers of labour will be required, and that representatives of elected bodies will also be pressed into the service. I am wondering if this is really representative enough. Would it not be as well, if they are to be really representative, that women should serve on these associations? It really is almost worth suggesting that "General" Booth's lieutenants of the Salvation Army should be utilised in some form or other, and if the national defence is going to be turned into a kind of pastime it seems only fair that the people who are somewhat unkindly termed "flannelled fools and mudded oafs" should also be allowed some form of representation. Whatever the representation may be, we may be sure that Lords-Lieutenant and persons of that kind will be fairly sound in their views. But when it comes to the representatives of elected bodies, I confess I begin to entertain some considerable fears. I am under the impression that there are many elected bodies in this country who are imbued with what is termed the spirit of anti-militarism, and I can hardly imagine a Welsh County Council, or, for the matter of that, an Irish County Council taking a keen interest in the development of national defence. If these associations succeed in their object, which to me appears absolutely incredible, the utmost that can be hoped is that in course of time an unorganised and partially-trained mob will grow up, so to speak, like mushrooms, on the go-as-you-please principle, which in time of emergency can be summoned and brought up to a state of efficiency.

It is possible that these patriotic persons who sacrifice themselves to do the national work may submit to these stringent conditions, but I very much doubt whether this will be the case. I remember very well that in 1900 it was suggested that the Volunteers should extend their training to something like a month, and it was very soon discovered that the proposal was not practicable; and in order to point out the fallacy of supposing that these bodies can be called out whenever it is thought necessary and brought up to the requisite pitch of efficiency, I would like to remind the House of what took place in 1899. In that year, when it was certain that we should have to go to war with the Boers, Lord Wolseley recommended that an army corps should be mobilised. Why was that not done? Because there were military reasons against it; but also because there were political reasons against it. It was known perfectly well that it would have been bitterly opposed by the Opposition at that time. I ask you to consider what would be the case, supposing at the present moment we were engaged in serious difficulties with a foreign Power. Bearing in mind the constitution of the present House of Commons I do not think it is any exaggeration to say that at least one half of the persons who support His Majesty's Government would be avowedly in favour of the country with whom we were engaged in differences. If it were proposed to call out these semi-trained or imperfectly trained men it would arouse the bitterest opposition, and I am convinced myself that it would be impossible to work in theory.

I must confess that in my humble opinion the present Secretary of State for War has missed a magnificent opportunity. Looking at the question how you will, treating it from whichever way you please, it is perfectly plain that our military liabilities are increasing and will continue to increase, and that the question we shall have to decide before very long is not the mere question of knocking off a few battalions or adding them on, but whether we are going to organise ourselves for war upon a system of universal service or whether we are prepared to pay an enormously enhanced price for the privilege of retaining the present voluntary system. Nobody, with the exception of the late Lord Salisbury, has ever enjoyed the opportunity which was in the possession of the present Secretary of State for War He had not only an immense majority behind him, but he had the reputation of being a moderate and a far-seeing statesman. It was in the power of this man to democratise, in the best sense of the word, our military system, and to make, as he ought, every citizen of this country realise his responsibility to his country. I daresay that if he had endeavoured to do so, he would at first have suffered. Very likely his windows would have been broken, but he would shortly have obtained compensation and would have gone down to history as a real man. Instead of that he has descended to pander to the ignorance, the indolence, the apathy, and the prejudice of that portion of the public which, unhappily, is always only too anxious to find any excuse for shirking its responsibility, and if, as some day may occur, we are overwhelmed in some great disaster, the responsibility for that disaster will rest more heavily on the present Secretary of State for War than on any man now living.

*VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: My Lords, I will stand but a few minutes between those Members of your Lordships' House who desire to speak from the point of view of the Army. I am sure we can all sympathise with the wish which they must feel to speak upon the military side of the question after the most inadequate discussions which have occurred in another place. I am sure that there are many men connected with the Army from their youth upwards who must have been deeply disappointed by the proposals of the Secretary of State for War. For my part I am prepared to say that I have much sympathy with Mr. Haldane. He occupies a very difficult post when the view held by the great majority of the Party which supports the Government as to the defences of the country is concerned. I doubt whether the Secretary of State for War is able to place implicit confidence in the backing which he would receive from the present Prime Minister. I do not know that the antecedents of the Prime Minister are such as would inspire Mr. Haldane with the necessary obstinacy to resist, in the present state of Parties, that reduction in the Estimates which we are told, and told again to-night in most emphatic terms, is the mandate the present Government have received.

The noble Earl, the Under-Secretary of State for War, in very solemn and official terms, read out the declaration, evidently an inspired declaration, with reference to the cardinal point of the policy of the present Government. He stated it most candidly. My noble friend just now alluded to it, but I think it is important to bring this point out well before the country. The cardinal point in the policy of the Government is that the nation requires a reduction in the expenditure on the Army. That is accepted by noble Lords opposite and by their Party. They call it a mandate. This mandate is inextricably mixed up with other mandates, and in what proportion the Government majority was due to the desire for diminished expenditure on the Army is difficult to ascertain. But has the nation been so directed, so instructed by the leaders of the Radical Party, that it is qualified to say that diminished expenditure is the first condition, efficiency and readiness for defence the second? Great is the responsibility upon the leaders in a new Parliament, with new forces coming to the front, who have not the same opportunity of studying the history of their own country, still less the history of other countries, to state clearly to their followers the existing conditions and necessities for the defence of the country.

The crude principle is laid down that expenditure is to be decreased, but I hope His Majesty's Government will give a distinct and clear answer to the question: Is the mandate exhausted by the present action of the Secretary of State for War? Is this a complete satisfaction, or is it only an instalment? How is the country to judge between the distinct proposals and the nebulous suggestions? How are we to discharge our duty with reference to the criticism of these proposals unless we know whether the mandate is exhausted, or whether behind these proposals now submitted further mandates remain to be fulfilled? There have been rumours that unless the Secretary of State for War carries his reductions much further than is intended by the present proposals he will have to go, but I hope that is not the view which is taken by the bulk of the Party; but if it is not the view of the bulk of the Party, a moment ought to come when the present Parliament, with the new forces which have come to the front, should be instructed that no hope can be held out of further reductions unless there is a great change in the state of Europe, and in present circumstances which necessitate preparation for defence. Have you the courage to say this to your supporters? You will agree that you ought to have the courage. Do not let the country be led to the belief that there are possibilities of indefinite reduction in the defensive forces on which the safety of this country depends.

The Government have laid claim to the support of the Army Council, but if I am not mistaken, the matter was put before the Army Council in this way—Reduction is a policy decided upon, advise us how best to carry it out. I ask the noble Marquess the Leader of the House whether that is not a fair way to put it. If that is so, do not tell us that the

Army Council are a party to your plan. Do not tell us that you have the leaders of the Army behind you. Tell us, if you like, that they have been the instrument by which you have effected a scientific adjustment in fulfilment of your mandate, but do not quote the Army Council as being behind your policy. I do not know whether the Army Council hold a position analagous to that of the Board of Admiralty or whether they have the same responsibility to the service. The Lords of the Admiralty have to sign the Estimates. I do not know whether the members of the Army Council have to sign the Estimates. If not, their responsibility is quite different.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: They do sign the Estimates.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: My noble friend tells me they do sign the Estimates. Well, if that is so, they read their duty—probably quite correctly—in a very different way from the Lords of the Admiralty, for the Lords of the Admiralty would resign if they thought sufficient money was not placed at their disposal for the needs of the Navy. If the Army Council is responsible only for the form of the reduction, it is not on the same footing as the Naval administration. I depreciate however, the tendency of Ministers to shelter themselves behind the *dicta* of councils or experts. There has been a growing tendency to do this on the part of recent Governments. There is a great danger in such a system. There is great difficulty in quoting opinions correctly, and if the opinion of councils or experts are quoted, those whose opinions are cited cannot protest against any even accidental ambiguity in the expression of opinions attributed to them. I say in no Party spirit, but as generally applicable to all Administrations—Let Ministers take the responsibility. The country knows that there is an Army Council, a Committee of Defence, behind them. To quote them is dangerous and unconstitutional, and, if we once quote, when they are not quoted there will be suspicion that the Government are not in harmony with their experts.

There is only one other point to which I should like to call attention. Reference has been made to the fact that battalions are to be taken away from Malta and Gibraltar. I ask whether Malta is not the most important centre in the Mediterranean from which to send troops in cases of emergency to Egypt or to India; and whether it is wise, in view of the agitation in Egypt and in North Africa, to denude Malta of troops. In conclusion, let me entreat His Majesty's Government to be careful, even if they think they must bow to the demands of their followers in the sense in which they have bowed to them, not by any language or any action to encourage in the new forces which are taking a greater share than they have ever done before in the administration of the country any weakening of the sense of patriotic sacrifice, the sense of public duty in the masses of the people upon whom all Governments must depend.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: My Lords, I think some of us are rather at a loss to understand the great bitterness of the earlier part of the speech of the noble Viscount who has just sat down. He attacked the Government with all the force of his irony, and as irony it was extremely effective; but the bitterness of it is difficult to understand, when in the course of his speech he had no argument to bring against the scheme propounded by the Secretary of State for War, except that he objected to troops being withdrawn from Malta. As regards Malta, everybody knows that it is an extremely unhealthy station, and that it is exceedingly difficult to train troops there with advantage; and with regard to the sending of troops to Egypt and other places, if the troops are sent from England you have their transport ready at hand, and a matter of a few days does not make much difference.

The noble Lord opposite (Lord Newton) was not the only person who predicted that when the new Secretary of State for War produced his scheme, he would be severely criticised and his scheme condemned. Well, he has produced his scheme, and the dreadful things which were prophesied have not happened, and I think any one who has followed the debate to-day will admit that there is singularly little to be said against that scheme. The attacks upon it have been of a more or less Party character, and have been somewhat mild and perfunctory. The scheme was not attacked on the same grounds as the schemes of Mr. Haldane's predecessors, and I feel convinced that, unless it is attacked by stronger arguments than those which have been delivered this evening, it will hold its ground.

What was there in the "crushing attack" of the noble Earl the late Under-Secretary of State for War? I will summarise his points as briefly as possible. The first charge he made—and it was reiterated by the noble Viscount who spoke last—was that Mr. Haldane had not kept faith with the House and the country. That is a charge extremely difficult to understand. Mr. Haldane said at first that he was not going to bring in any scheme until he had thought the matter over and thoroughly investigated the question. Well, having thought the matter over and thoroughly investigated the question, he has now brought in his scheme, and, whatever else the scheme was to include, we all knew it would effect some reduction in the Army. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Newton) complains that a reduction is to be effected before anything else is put in its place. If you put something in its place it is not a reduction.

LORD NEWTON: Something much cheaper in its place.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: That is what we are going to do.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: What are you going to do?

LORD GRIMTHORPE: I think the Government have explained very clearly what their proposals are. If the Government took away with one hand and replaced with another they would be stultifying themselves. It is also complained that the Secretary of State for War has not given sufficient credit to his predecessors. I do not know what credit is due to them, seeing that they first brought in one scheme and then another, both of which were pronounced unworkable. Therefore, for what were they to receive credit? The third form of attack was that an unhappy and unfortunate selection had been made of the battalions that were to be disbanded. I presume that whatever selection had been made it would have been open to that attack. But I do think there was something in what Earl Temple said as regards the reduction in the Guards. And for this reason, that those who favour reductions in the Army, do so on the grounds of economy and efficiency. Now, there is no doubt as to the efficiency of the two Guards battalions in question, and they are also an economical force. Therefore, at first sight, neither on the ground of economy nor of efficiency, should they be reduced. But we are told that they are not required for the striking force, and that therefore they are an unnecessary expense, and, if unnecessary, naturally they have to go.

Although the noble Viscount had not much to say against the scheme as it stood, he seemed to hint that it was an instalment of worse things. When the worse things come it will be time enough to refer to them, but they have not come yet, and my confidence in the Secretary of State for War is such that I do not believe they ever will come. We who defend this scheme against attack stand in a somewhat different position from those who defended previous schemes from attack. They said, "It is all very well to attack a scheme; produce something in its place. What is your alternative scheme?" We cannot say that to noble Lords opposite, because they have done nothing else but produce alternative schemes for years past, and each one of their schemes has been found to be unworkable. The big majority who support the present Government find no fault with this scheme, but there was not a single scheme brought forward by the other side when they were in office which was not attacked and considered most unsatisfactory by their own supporters.

The noble Viscount laughed at the word "mandate." The word "mandate" has been to some extent covered with ridicule from many points of view; but a man must be blind to what has been going on in the country who maintains that the people did not give clear expression of a desire that some reduction should be made in the vast expenditure on the Army. The Members of the late Government were anxious to reduce it themselves if they could. Mr. Arnold-Forster pointed out the necessity for reduction.

He knew we had arrived at a stage at which the nation would cry "Stop." And here we come to the point Lord Goschen made about the Army Council. He asked, "Did you tell the Army Council there must be a reduction?" It goes without saying that in asking the Army Council to consider the scheme, the general conditions were laid down. In any scheme which has to be produced the general conditions have to be laid down. I presume that in this case the Cabinet naturally laid down the general conditions and the Army Council produced their scheme—at any rate, the scheme has their support.

I cannot discover in any of the speeches of the critics of the Government any sign that they have asked themselves what our Army is for, and how much we can spend upon it. All that they do is to draw gloomy prognostications of fearful possibilities in some future eventualities. But where can those eventualities occur? They can only occur on the Continent, in Egypt, or on the Indian frontier. When one listened to what the noble and gallant Earl on the cross benches said about the German Army the only impression it made on one's mind was that England would never be so mad as to embark on a land war with a Continental Power possessing such overwhelming forces. Therefore, I think the country understands that it is not on the Continent that these eventualities will occur. Well then, is it in Egypt? Surely an expeditionary force of 150,000 men is quite sufficient to deal with any trouble likely to arise in Egypt.

Then as to the Indian frontier. The noble and gallant Earl said that 500,000 men at least would be required to defend the Indian frontier. Some few years ago I rode from end to end of the Indian frontier and penetrated every pass through which an invasion could take place, and I can say that the opinion of all the military men on the Indian frontier was that 200,000 men would be ample to defend it. I never heard an opinion expressed by any military man on the frontier that more than that number would be required, and when we consider the experience of the Boer War and the fact that 40,000 men in a comparatively open country could hold at bay 250,000 men for three years, surely 200,000 British soldiers can defend the Indian frontier—the most difficult frontier in the world. Therefore I think it may be said that we have no need for any larger Army than the Secretary of State for War proposes to maintain. It cannot be required in any portion of the world in any contingency that is likely to come within the range of practical politics.

Lord Roberts said that there is no country in the world that enjoys her safety on such easy terms. It must not be forgotten that we are paying £93,000,000 for our military and naval defence, and that no other country spends more than £40,000,000. We spend more than double that of any other country, and yet it is said that we defend our country on easy terms. The noble and gallant Earl also called attention to the unfitness and unwillingness of our Auxiliary Forces. Was that fair? He said that only one man in fifty was prepared to serve his country. I do not think that is quite fair. In the first place I may say that people can serve their country in other ways besides in military service, and the people who are engaged in accumulating the sinews of war are also serving their country. If noble Lords imagine that war could be carried on without money they take a different view from that of Lord Beaconsfield, who said after the Crimean War that the one thing that was necessary was to accumulate the financial resources of the country and not spend too much on our armaments.

I think the Government are perfectly right in appealing to the country to provide the Auxiliary Forces that they require. Such an appeal has never been made to the country before. The Auxiliary Forces have been discouraged, snubbed, and sneered at, and military generals of great eminence have, instead of encouraging them, told them that they were no use. I am firmly convinced that the Government in telling the Auxiliary Forces that this great duty of defending the country is laid upon them are acting wisely, and that there will be an adequate response. I am sure that if you show the country plainly and clearly that they must supplement the Regular Army by a Volunteer Army, in order to fulfil certain military duties which cannot be discharged without that Auxiliary Force, they will provide it. Anyhow, I think you ought to make this experiment before you resort to conscription, which is utterly repugnant to the feeling of every Englishman.

*LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, there has been a great deal of criticism this evening which has remained unanswered, and I do not propose to add to the mass of it. I came here intending to do so, but since those who have spoken have not as yet received any reply to what they said, it seems to be idle and useless to go on reiterating our questions and our complaints. But I cannot leave the remarks of the three speakers who have addressed us from the Government side of the House altogether unchallenged. The noble Lord who has just sat down, whose disregard for the conventions of this House is only equalled by the jovial self-confidence with which he makes statements unsupported by facts, and assertions unsupported by argument, made several very singular remarks. I will not refer to such remarks as the one to the effect that those who are accumulating money for themselves are providing the sinews of war and thus rendering public service, but I wish to refer particularly to the remark with which he opened his speech. He said he was at a loss to understand how the noble Viscount who had preceded him could have spoken with such Party bitterness. I am certain that there is no noble Lord in this House who will endorse that opinion. If ever there was a speech made with an absence of Party bitterness and from a true patriotic feeling, it was that speech.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: I did not say Party bitterness.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Yes, you did.

*LORD AMPTHILL: The noble Lord went on to say that the arguments used against the present Army scheme were so bad that they required no answer. I hardly think that is a sufficient reply.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: I did not say they required no answer. I said they were not likely to upset the scheme of the Minister for War.

*LORD AMPTHILL: The effect was the same. That was the impression his words gave. I pass on to what was said by the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty, who wound up his speech by protesting that he had not spoken in a Party spirit, and by asking noble Lords on this side of the House for their support to a scheme of Army reform. It is quite true that the noble Lord did not speak in a Party spirit. He said hardly anything at all. I think noble Lords will agree with me that he did not make any attempt to answer what had been said on this side of the House, and it was only in that way that he was able to avoid Party spirit. I need hardly assure the noble Lord that we on this side of the House are more than ready to give our support to any scheme which provides for the national defence and the safety of the Empire; but if we are to co-operate, to give our support and avoid unnecessary criticism, surely it must be on the condition that we have frank explanations of the intentions of the Government; and if, in the desire to elicit those explanations, we put questions, we should be met fairly and squarely and be given answers.

No answer has been given to anything of importance that has been said on this side of the House. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War was content to assure us that the reason for the reduction was that the country in general and the Government in particular desired it. We all desire economy. We should all be glad to see a reduction in the expenditure on the Army, but we do not wish to see a reduction which is combined with a loss of efficiency; and what we asked for were such explanations as would assure us that the proposed alterations and reductions would not result in a loss of efficiency.

The noble Earl went on to tell us that the Government had had a mandate from the country to spend less money. We have heard a great deal about mandates and are perfectly ready to believe that the Government have an inexhaustible store of them; but it is difficult for us to swallow this one when the first action of the Party now in power was to pass in the other House Resolutions in favour of payment of Members, franking of letters, payment of election expenses, and other costly luxuries of the kind. The noble Earl went on to say that the scheme did not propose to reduce the artillery, but only the imaginary strength of the artillery. I think that here again he missed the point. If he had said that the scheme reduced the "potential" strength of the artillery instead of "imaginary" strength, it would have been more in accordance with fact.

In regard to the shortage of officers—an important point—the noble Earl went out of his way to give us an answer to a criticism which had not been made. It would have been far better for him if he had not done so. He told us that none of the officers of disbanded regiments would be dismissed, but that they would be absorbed into the strength of other regiments. Does the noble Earl not see that that is in effect a reduction? These officers would simply fill the places of officers who are obliged to retire within the course of the next few years, and they would not remain as a reserve of leaders. If these officers are to be absorbed they will not be there as Reserve Officers. The First Lord of the Admiralty was content to dismiss the arguments advanced by the noble and gallant Earl, who is, perhaps, the most experienced soldier in the world, by saying that conscription was impossible, without precedent, and contrary to reason. I ask your Lordships whether those are replies to arguments which are worthy of this House or of this occasion.

There is one point in particular on which I trust it is not too late to expect an answer from His Majesty's Government. The whole of this Army reform question hangs on that of the Militia, and I think the speech which was made by the noble Duke behind me (the Duke of Bedford), is sufficiently clear in the memory of your Lordships to render it unnecessary for me to reiterate what he said. What we want to know is whether the Militia are to be sent abroad, when they go to reinforce the Regular Army, in battalions or in companies. That is the whole point. We have had no clear and unequivocal statement on this point. Reading between the lines of the speech of the Secretary of State for War, it seems necessary to assume that the Militia will go abroad by companies and not by battalions. As a Militia officer I assure your Lordships that the proposed change is a distinction without a difference; it is actually a perpetuation of the old system which has been universally condemned.

The noble Duke and other speakers proved that the effect would be exactly the same as if you deprived the Militia battalions of the pick of their men. The company would in no conceivable circumstances be sent as it stood on parade in ordinary times; imperfections would be remedied from the strength of the battalion It is inconceivable that any other course would be adopted than that the weak men should be replaced by strong ones, and that the best officers would be sent with them. Where, then, would be the rest of the battalion? Where, as the noble Duke asked, would be the commanding officer and those next in rank to him? Presumably they would stay at home. Where would the battalion itself be? What share would it have of what is popularly known as glory, of everything which goes to inspire the soldier and to make for military ardour? I had a great deal I should like to have said this evening, but I have contented myself with making these few criticisms, for it seems to me that even at the last moment we may hope for a reply from His Majesty's Government on the one point that I consider the most important one: What is to be the exact treatment of the Militia?

*THE EARL OF ERROL: My Lords, I wish to associate myself with what has fallen from the noble Lord who has just sat down. It seems to me that none of the noble Lords who have spoken from this side of the House have received any answer to their questions. I confess I was much disappointed at the very carefully prepared and guarded answer given by the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War. The scheme put forward by the Government is admittedly incomplete, and the discussion in the other House was insufficient to elucidate many points upon which we must be informed before being able to pronounce any definite judgment on the scheme as a whole. I had hoped that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary would have cleared up and amplified some of the more obscure points, but I regret I was disappointed.

The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition said the other day that the people of this country were not so much apathetic as puzzled. I think that after the speech of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary they will not be less puzzled than they were before. The only thing which seems to me to be clear in this scheme is what I may call the destructive portion of it; the constructive part is vague and indefinite. There are suggestions as to an improved Militia, as to its being better trained and made more ready for war; but we have not been vouchsafed any opinion as to how this is to be achieved. The noble Earl gave us very little information at all. He took up what I think I may call a strategic position behind his military advisers, and refused entirely to be drawn by the questions of my noble friend Lord Donoughmore or of the noble Duke behind me.

I cannot but think that the War Office have been lamentably weak in the advice which they have given to the Government. They seem to me to have been wanting in backbone to the most deplorable degree. There are hardly any officers of any standing outside the magic circle of the War Office who do not contemplate these reductions with alarm or dismay. The military correspondent of *The Times*, in an admirable letter a few days ago, pointed out that this reduction was not a reduction merely of 20,000 men, but that it amounted to a reduction of about 42,000 men. This is how he arrived at that figure. Section D of the Army Reserve, which has about 4,000 men put into it every year, is to be abolished temporarily. But at the end of four years this will mean a reduction of 16,000 men. Then there are another 7,000 men who will have to be taken off the Reserve owing to the reduction of the ten battalions and the reduction in the number of artillery, all of which were, of course, Reserve producing cadres. I think it is most regrettable that these reductions should be made before there is something to put in in their place, and before the resuscitated Militia—and we have not been told how it is to be made up—is rendered capable of taking its place in the field.

We have not been told how the men are to be got or how they are to be trained. Neither have we been told how we are to get youths at 19 instead of 17, which is the present age for the Militia. There is no doubt they ought to have more training if they are to be put in the first Line; but more training means increased expenditure, and we have the authority of the Norfolk Commission that, as at present constituted, the Militia are not fit for the fighting Line. I think the suggestion that the Militia should serve abroad is admirable, but we have not been told what inducements will be given to get them to undertake these new responsibilities. The question was several times asked as to whether the 30,000 men of the expeditionary force were to be made up from drafts or from companies. If they are to be made up from drafts I should like to know what difference there is between these 30,000 men and the 30,000 Militia Reserve which existed before the war and which has since been abolished. We should also like to know whether these Militiamen will be allowed to enlist in the Line. These things are very important. The complaint has always been, amongst the Militia, that they have been used merely as feeders for the Line. Very little has been said about the provision of officers, and this is one of the most important points. Lord Roberts said, in a speech last year, that some of the battalions that were sent out to South Africa came out very nearly ten officers short, and for that reason it was impossible for him to send them to the front. The Norfolk Commission also tells us that the training of Militia officers is insufficient to enable them properly to lead troops in the field and especially incompletely-trained troops. This shortage of officers is a very serious thing. It is no doubt very ingenious on the part of His Majesty's Government to say that they have a superfluity of officers simply by doing away with battalions. The 300 officers who are to be reduced will not be an addition to the number of officers in the Army because they will eventually become absorbed.

I want to say one word as to the reduction of the Guards I do not wish to speak from a sentimental point of view, although nobody recognises more than I do the importance of sentiment in an Army and the *esprit de corps* which it engenders. I want to argue this purely on the ground of efficiency, and I maintain that the Government have shown no valid reason why these splendid battalions should be reduced. In deciding whether a unit was to remain the Secretary of State made use of these words—

> "The purpose of the Government has been to go through every department of the Army and ask each man, 'What are you here for? Do you justify the money spent on you?' If he cannot answer he goes off; if he can make out a case he remains."

The answer to that, in the case of the Guards, is emphatically "Yes." It has been clearly shown that these battalions are in a very high state of efficiency. Lord Wolseley always maintained that to have a strong body like the Guards at headquarters, which could be mobilised and sent off at a moment's notice, was a very valuable asset in the defence of the country. I do think that it is the height of folly to destroy such units and to replace them with troops on a Militia basis, to abolish battalions which you know can be relied upon and which have proved their value over and over again, not only at home but in the field, and to replace them by troops which may or may not be efficient, and which must be inferior to those you are disbanding.

If it be necessary to justify the pre-election statements of the extreme followers of His Majesty's Government, I cannot see why they do not reduce numbers instead of units. I know that it will be said that to reduce the numbers in the Line would ruin the battalions as far as their draft-producing *status* went. But this does not apply to the Guards. The Guards supply no drafts and cannot be referred to as in a condition of squeezed lemons. This proposed reduction will be a great hardship to officers and non-commissioned officers, not only in these battalions, but in the other battalions, in the stoppage of promotion. It will also be a great hardship on the non-commissioned officers of the Brigade. There are quarter-masters-sergeants, pay-sergeants, and drill-sergeants who have obtained their positions by their own hard work and whose chances of promotion will be greatly diminished. The same applies to the sergeants and non-commissioned officers behind them, who will lose their chance of advancement.

We have no information as to what is to be done with the Volunteers except that no further money is to be spent on them. The extent of sympathetic treatment they may expect was shown in the House not long ago when they were denied assistance from the Government in the hiring of ranges, and this at a time when it is recognised that shooting is of the first importance. I do not think this decision is likely to encourage the Volunteers. As to the scheme for managing the force under local influence it seems to me that this is merely a shuffling of responsibility from the War Office on to the shoulders of the county councils. A foreign correspondent the other day said, in *The Times*, that he was unable to grasp an army raised in detachments like a fire brigade and managed in the same way; and I doubt very much whether management of an Army by county councillors will lead to efficiency, it certainly will not lead to economy. The handing over to local bodies elected for more or less political reasons of responsibility which should essentially attach to the State seems to me a retrograde and dangerous experiment.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I do not think that we on this side of the House have any reason to be dissatisfied with the course of the discussion which has taken place. The Ministerial position was, at the very outset of our debate, profoundly shaken by the heavy pounding which it sustained at the hands of my noble friend Lord Donoughmore. I believe that is what is known in military parlance as an artillery preparation, and I congratulate my noble friend upon the effective character of the particular artillery preparation which he delivered.

We have heard several speeches in reply to that of my noble friend. In particular, we had a lengthened rejoinder from the Under-Secretary of State for War. Will he forgive me for suggesting that he did not seem exactly to appreciate the points which my noble friend desired to drive home? There were two main counts in his indictment. The first is that the particular reductions which have been selected by His Majesty's Government are unfortunate and injudicious reductions. The second count is a different and, I think, a still more important one. We complain that these reductions have been finally decided upon, and are actually in process of being carried out, before any decision has been arrived at as to what I would call the compensatory measures by which the efficiency of the Army is to be increased at other points. Not only have those measures apparently not yet been adopted, but no attempt has been made this evening to explain their nature to your Lordships.

I wish, if I may, to drive home the pertinent question which was asked by my noble friend, Lord Goschen. The Under-Secretary sheltered himself behind the opinion of his military advisers. Now, what we want to know, and I hope the noble Marquess will give us a precise answer on that point, is whether these reductions were imposed in principle on the Army Council, and whether the Army Council have merely done the best they could, accepting those reductions as the point of departure, and, having accepted them, loyally supported the Secretary of State for War. And I should like to add the further question, Can the noble Marquess tell us distinctly that the Army Council approve of these reductions being actually carried out before those other measures for improving the efficiency of the Militia and the Auxiliary Forces have been even outlined to us? May I say that in the meanwhile we have a right to be a little incredulous as to the value of these unknown measures for increasing the efficiency of the Auxiliary Forces? We are told that their result is to be an increase of no less than 50 per cent. in the fighting efficiency of the Army as a whole. I desire to make a passing comment on that statement. We have been told that one of the objects of His Majesty's Government is to give a lead to the democracies which are at present suffering under the overwhelming weight of these national armaments. I do not know that it is exactly our business to give a lead in a matter of that kind. But suppose it is, what sort of a lead are you giving to the suffering democracies when you announce to them that your fighting force—the force with which you may have some day or other to hit them—is going to be half as strong again as it has been in recent years?

We are, of course, all of us, for economy, and we cannot really allow the present Government to patent the phrase that the Army is for use and not for show. By all means let His Majesty's Government lop off any useless excrescences if they can find them. But what we complain of, and what we believe, is that these reductions which you are going to make are real reductions in the fighting efficiency of the Army. We believe that you are going to undo a great part of the work of the last twenty years, during which the strength and fighting efficiency of the Army has certainly been not a little improved. I ask the House to remember that the increases of the Army which are now going to be apparently done away with began long before the South African War. About the year 1896 public attention was greatly directed to these matters. Men began to ask what were the objects for which our Army was maintained, and the Government of the day became satisfied that the Army, as it then stood, was not strong enough to fulfil those objects. Further and still larger increases were made, and made deliberately after the South African War with the result that, as the Secretary of State for War has recently admitted, the Army, when he took office, was in a state of greater efficiency than it had been at any previous time.

Our regret is that you are going to pull down this useful work, and that you are going to do so before you know exactly, in your own minds, what you are going to put in its place. You have selected for the application of the pruning knife two battalions of Guards. I have heard the statement that has been made in defence of that proposal, and I am bound to say it seems to me a most unconvincing explanation. These are troops, which in point of physique, in point of the conduct and the character of the men, in point of military efficiency, are the *élite* of the Army of this country. They are an economical force, economical on account of the great number of Reservists which they produce; and I ask your Lordships to bear this in mind, that if you desire to have a sufficient Regular Army upon terms which shall not be prohibitive the only way you can do it is by maintaining a large Army Reserve.

The value of the Army Reserve was demonstrated in the year 1900 at the outset of the South African War. I trust it will never be forgotten that at that moment, when we called upon our Reservists, 98 per cent. of them came back from civil life and took their places with the Colours, with the result that, as Lord Wolseley stated in a paper which is published with the Report of the noble Earl's Commission, we were able to send out from this country something like 114,000 men—a more efficient and larger force than had ever before been despatched from these shores. The noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty reminded us that these additional battalions of Guards were called into existence upon condition that the Guards should undertake a certain amount of service outside the limits of this country. That arrangement, he said, had fallen through, and therefore it was the intention of the Government to get rid of the extra battalions. Historically that statement is correct. I have always greatly regretted that the arrangement under which we proposed that a certain number of Guards battalions should take a short turn of foreign service should have fallen through. I am under the impression that there are many officers in the Guards who regret it also; but, at any rate, you have got these admirable battalions to hand and you are actually at this moment going to revert to the original arrangement to this extent, that you are going to send the third battalion of Coldstream Guards to Egypt. I would suggest to His Majesty's Ministers why not, before you make up your minds to get rid of these battalions of Guards, consider whether the original arrangement could not be revived, and whether those two battalions could not be allowed to remain in existence upon condition that the Guards took their turn of service in Egypt, in Gibraltar, or elsewhere in the Mediterranean

Much has been said during the course of this discussion of the manner in which the Royal Artillery is affected by the proposals of the Secretary of State. As to that I would venture to say whatever other arm you tamper with you should not tamper with the Royal Artillery. I cannot help reminding the House that it is a somewhat remarkable fact that one of the last acts of the Liberal Government in 1894 was to tamper with the Royal Artillery. The present Prime Minister, who was then Secretary of State for War, in deference to the pressure, I presume, of his military advisers, desired to add eight batteries to the artillery, and he did so by stealing a certain number of guns from the artillery depôts and by converting a certain number of six-gun batteries into four-gun batteries. We had to put that right when we came into office, and it is a somewhat singular coincidence that that having been the last act of the former Liberal Government, the first act of the present Liberal Government should be to play tricks with the artillery.

We added very largely to the strength of the Field Artillery, and we did so for two reasons. In the first place, because our advisers told us that it was absolutely necessary that the number of guns per thousand with our troops should not be less than the number of guns per thousand with the troops of Continental armies. The other reason was this. We had then, as we have now, a large number of imperfectly trained Auxiliary Forces, and it was impressed upon us by the best military judges that the fact of these Auxiliary Forces being imperfectly trained made it doubly necessary that they should be stiffened by an ample force of Regular Field Artillery. It was for those reasons that we added a great number of batteries to the Horse and Field Artillery. Have the circumstances altered? Your Lordships have heard this evening from Lord Roberts something of the proportion of guns to men in the French and German armies. We shall fall miserably below that standard if our Artillery strength is diminished. And what about the stiffening of the Auxiliary Forces? I am under the impression that after that force of which we have heard so much—the expeditionary force of 150,000 men—has left these shores we shall have between 300,000 and 400,000 Auxiliary troops in this country. So far as I can make out there will only be left as a stiffening to that great body of men about 216 guns of the Regular Artillery—guns, that is, which would be enough only for a force of some 43,000 men.

I wish to say one word upon the allegation that when we increased the Field Artillery we were careful to provide the guns but forgot all about the *personnel* necessary to man them. Nothing is further from the truth. What happened was this. We knew perfectly well that we wanted a large Reserve for our artillery, but we could not produce that Reserve unless we had the units to produce it. You can no more produce a Reserve without units than you can produce eggs without chickens, and pending the development of that artillery Reserve which is developing capitally at this moment, the Defence Committee actually discussed and approved a proposal which, as far as I could make out, does not differ materially from the proposal for which the Secretary of State and his representatives take so much credit—I mean that a certain number of Militia Artillery should be used to constitute ammunition columns for the Regular Field Artillery.

But what are you going to do in order to strengthen the artillery? You apparently are going to reduce 36 batteries, to get rid of 3,000 or 4,000 men, and to put an end to the arrangement under which a certain proportion of the artillery is engaged on a three years service. Now, my Lords, what will be the result of that? The output of Reservists will be enormously diminished by the change. It is obvious that a three years service gives you an infinitely greater number of Reservists. I will give the House a formula which I have never forgotten, and which always seems to me to be a very instructive one. One hundred men on a three years term of enlistment give you an output of ninety Reservists; one hundred men on a seven years term gives you only twenty-five Reservists. That will afford your Lordships some idea of the effect upon the Artillery Reserve of substituting a six-years term for a three-years term in regard to a considerable part of the force. What are you going to get to make good the deficiency? You are going to add to the artillery a considerable number of men upon that "Militia basis" which is the cathword of these discussions. The Militia basis is one of the mysteries of this question. Nobody has told us yet what the Militia basis is, and I confess I have not the slightest idea. But one thing I am sure of—that men collected for the artillery on the Militia basis will not be a substitute for the skilled artillery Reservist who has spent three or six years with the Colours in a battery.

Mention of the Militia basis leads me to the subject of the Militia. That part of the case has been so thoroughly dealt with by the noble Duke the Duke of Bedford, and the noble Lord who sits by him, that I will not go over the ground again; but I will remind your Lordships that the old Militia grievance which has been again and again discussed in this House is the two-fold grievance that we have hitherto allowed the Line to compete with the Militia for recruits, and that Militiamen have been filched from the Militia for the benefit of the Line, with the result that the Militia has been, to quote a phrase frequently used, bled to death by the process. Some of my noble friends have endeavoured to elicit from the representatives of His Majesty's Government some explanation of the manner in which that grievance—for it is an undoubted grievance—of the Militia is to be dealt with, and I do hope that we may receive at any rate some indication of the lines upon which His Majesty's Government mean to proceed. I have been able to collect no information as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government upon this point except to this extent, that the Militia are to be rendered liable for service abroad and that Militia battalions are to be attached as third or fourth battalions to battalions of the Line. There is nothing very novel or original about either of these proposals. We have already, in this House, passed a Bill rendering the Militia liable to service abroad; and as for the attaching of Militia battalions to Line battalions, that was part of Mr. Cardwell's original scheme, and you will find it in the old Army List of the seventies. We are equally in the dark with regard to the intentions of His Majesty's Government as to the Volunteers. I am told—I shall be corrected if I am wrong—that the late Secretary of State had intended to get rid of some 30,000 or thereabouts of Volunteers who had been reported to be medically or otherwise unfit to serve. I believe that arrangement has been cancelled by the present Government; that is to say, an economy which I suppose would have run to £50,000 or £60,000 a year is not to take place, and a number of more or less incompetent people are still to be counted as part of the efficient forces of the country.

We have to fall back upon the *dictum* of the Secretary of State that we are still in a state of consideration about the Auxiliary Forces. I should be rather inclined to say that we were in a state of bewilderment with regard to the Auxiliary

Forces. We are told that there is to be a military local government under the control of the people themselves. That is a mysterious announcement which I, for one, am quite unable to interpret. But what is perfectly clear is this, that these reforms in the Militia and in the Volunteers are, at present, in the womb of the future. It is a *paulo post futurum* scheme, and in the meanwhile the Auxiliary Forces remain, I presume, in the condition to which the Commission presided over by the noble Earl opposite (Lord Elgin) and the Commission presided over by the Duke of Norfolk called attention; that is to say, they are not fit to be used on a Militia or on any other basis as troops to oppose to the Regular troops of another Power. In the face of that I do not see what comfort we can derive from all the promises that these forces are to be grouped, or to be dovetailed, or to be brought into closer contact with the other portions of the Army to which we have listened this evening.

Surely we are not altogether unreasonable when we ask that before these reductions are allowed to proceed any further the country shall have time, both to consider what the real effect of those reductions will be, and also what measures you are going to take in order to restore at one point the strength which you are taking away at other points. We are in ignorance as to the extent of the sacrifice which we are going to make, and we are also in ignorance as to the extent of the pecuniary saving which we are likely to derive from these operations. All attempts to elicit even an approximate estimate of that saving have, so far as I am aware, been altogether futile.

In these circumstances we do venture to say to your Lordships that the moment is not an opportune one for a haphazard reduction in the strength of the British Army. The condition of Europe is one suggesting that the most grave and portentous developments might, at any time, present themselves. In Asia and in Africa you have that pan-Islamic upheaval to which Lord Cromer has called attention. In South Africa you are going yourselves to liberate forces which may prove extremely dangerous. Not only that. Our attitude in these matters is being very closely watched by others. It is being watched by the Powers with whom we may one of these days have to reckon. It is being watched by our friends, who know that international friendship is of no great value unless you can, when necessary, express it in terms of men and ships. We are watched by our allies, who entered into partnership with us, believing in our strength and in our steadfastness of purpose. We are watched by the people of India, who are becoming every day better educated and more intelligent, and better able to follow the course of events in this country. And we are watched, last of all, by our own Colonies, whose great desire is that the Empire should be strong at its heart. I earnestly trust that in our haste to diminish a burden which may be irksome, but which, after all, has not yet proved intolerable, we shall not do anything to diminish our ability to meet our engagements or to secure the safety of the Empire.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, we have had a long and interesting discussion, but not at all too long when we consider the importance of the question. The reductions upon which Mr. Haldane has decided have not commended themselves to noble Lords opposite. Whether they would have been willing to agree to any other reductions by which the weight of military expenditure might have been diminished I do not know. But at all events, those which have been selected by His Majesty's Government are not viewed favourably by the majority of this House. That is a circumstance which I have observed very frequently to occur in the case of proposals of this kind submitted by any Government. The general question of the reduction of expenditure is avoided, and the particular proposals are subjected to criticism.

I will endeavour, as briefly as I may, to follow some of the remarks made by my noble friend who has just sat down in reference to these reductions. In our judgment we do not believe that the reductions which we are intending to carry out will in any way diminish the efficiency of the Army. We believe, on the contrary, that they will tend to increase that efficiency; and, in the second place, with reference to a remark which was made by my noble friend, Lord Goschen, I should like to say that I entirely agree with him that it is not becoming in any Government to hide their responsibility behind their subordinates. This is the last thing His Majesty's Government contemplate doing. We take upon ourselves, as we ought to take upon ourselves, the full responsibility of our acts. But when my noble friend Lord Goschen laid down that sound principle, which I readily accept, it struck me that it was perhaps not altogether consistent with some other parts of the remarks he made in which he questioned us in regard to what had passed between the Secretary of State and the Army Council.

I agree with the noble Viscount, Lord Goschen, that we ought not, and we do not desire, in the slightest degree to shelter ourselves behind our expert colleagues. On the contrary we consult them, and I believe that no Secretary of State has ever consulted his expert colleagues more frequently and more fully than my right hon. friend Mr. Haldane. But he has done so under a full understanding—and I have his authority for saying so—that the final responsibility entirely and completely rests upon the Secretary of State and the Government of which he is a member. My right hon. friend, as the noble Earl the Under-Secretary said in his able speech, has always found from the members of the Army Council the most full and complete support; but he does not desire to throw upon them, and he has not thrown upon them, any responsibility which does not belong to them.

The noble Viscount remarked that the Army Council were not in the same position as the Board of Admiralty. That is correct. They do not sign the Estimates. I have ascertained that fact, and so far as that may lessen their responsibility it is quite true. But the Army Council are a body which was established by the Government of noble Lords opposite, and they have worked, I am bound to say, in the most cordial manner with my right hon. friend. They, of course, knew what were the desires, what were the views of my right hon. friend with regard to the future arrangement of the Army. They knew, of course, that he was anxious for reductions, but they knew also that he was anxious for reductions which would not diminish but largely increase the efficiency of the Army. It is on the understanding and in the belief that these reductions will have that effect that my right hon. friend, acting in perfect concert with the Army Council, has submitted his proposals to Parliament.

My noble friend who has just sat down complained that the particular reductions which are contemplated by the Government, and which they intend to carry out, are wrong ones. We propose to reduce altogether ten battalions—eight battalions of the Line and two battalions of Guards. It is known that Mr. Arnold-Forster contemplated reducing fourteen battalions, and therefore I cannot think that there is anything so very alarming in the proposals of His Majesty's Government when they are only asking to reduce ten battalions. Fourteen battalions is the number in excess of the battalions ten years ago, but instead of reducing those battalions altogether, the whole proposal that we have made in respect to Line battalions is for a reduction of eight. I do not believe that will be found to be an alarming reduction at all. I believe that it is a reduction which may be made perfectly safely, and if we had not that conviction we should not propose it.

Great objection has been taken this evening to our proposal to reduce two battalions of Guards. I do not know whether those who have raised these objections would be ready to accept a reduction of two more Line battalions in the place of the two battalions of Guards. In the opinion of the Secretary of State, looking to the necessity of maintaining a due relation between the battalions of the Line at home and the battalions of the Line abroad, you could not conveniently make a larger reduction than that of eight Line battalions. Therefore, as in the judgment of the Government we can safely reduce ten battalions, my right hon. friend considered whether any reduction could be made of infantry in another quarter, and his attention was drawn to these two battalions of Guards. These two battalions were added a few years ago when my noble friend who has just sat down was Secretary of State for War, and, as he has frankly admitted, they were added for a particular and definite purpose. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary quoted Lord Lansdowne's exact words in his speech. That speech, however, was delivered some hours ago, and possibly your Lordships may not recollect them; but the words of the noble Marquess were important, and I will read them again. Lord Lansdowne said—

> "It must, however, be clearly understood that we are able to recommend this increase and justify the expenditure which it involves only upon condition that we are allowed to make use of the brigade to help us in overcoming our difficulties and to require from it a reasonable contribution towards the relief of the present strain on the Army system."

That was stated by my noble friend to be the condition, and the only condition, upon which that increase could be proposed. That scheme fell through. Whether it was right that it should fall through or not I will not discuss, but it did fall through, and I do not think, therefore, that it is just and fair that we should be complained of because, that being the case, we turned to these two battalions for the purpose of making a further reduction.

We have heard very reasonable arguments on this subject. We heard a particularly moderate and fair statement from Lord Temple upon the subject earlier in the debate. But I can hold out no hope that we shall be able to withdraw our proposals in this matter. I have seen it stated—and I think it has been said in the debate to-night—that the junior battalion of the Guards is the one battalion of the Irish Guards, and that that might have been reduced. I think it is obvious, for general reasons, that a regiment which was raised in the circumstances in which that regiment was raised should not now be selected, not for the reduction of one of its battalions, but for its own absolute destruction.

My noble friend who has just sat down warned us in somewhat solemn tones not to tamper with the artillery. We do not intend to tamper with the artillery. We do not think that we are tampering with the artillery. With a great deal that fell earlier in the debate from my noble friend Lord Denbigh I quite agree; but it appeared to me that the greater part of what he said did not touch the question at all. No doubt for a great many of the purposes of the artillery you must have the highest trained men that you can get. All that my right hon. friend says is that there are other duties of a different kind and a different description which may be discharged by men not so fully trained. The noble Earl opposite, Lord Donoughmore, seemed rather displeased that we had taken some credit to ourselves for employing men on a Militia basis for this purpose, because he said it was a plan which had been contemplated by the late Government. If that be so, take all the credit for it, but please do not attack us for doing it.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The Secretary of State said that it seemed we had forgotten this. He did not give us any credit for doing anything; he accused us of negligence.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: It cannot be so very desperate a mistake when, after all, we have been accused of stealing in having taken possession of it. My noble friend asked what was the proportion of guns per thousand men which we proposed compared with other countries. We propose five guns per thousand, and that is fully up to the standard of other European countries. France has 3½ guns per thousand, and Japan 4½, so that I do not think we have fallen so very much behind the standard of other nations in that respect. My noble friend also said something about the Artillery Reserve. The proposal of the Secretary of State is that the Artillery should have six years with the Colours and six years in the Reserve. There was a system of three years which supplied a quicker Reserve, but, after what was said with so much truth by Lord Denbigh as to the extreme importance of the most complete and full training of artillery, I venture to suggest—and this I know is the opinion of the Secretary of State—that three years may easily be too short a period for fully training artillerymen, and that you had better have rather a smaller Reserve of men who have had six years' full training if they were thereby rendered more fit to return to their duties and to perform them in a satisfactory manner.

I think I have touched upon all the points mentioned by my noble friend opposite so far as they affect the Regular Army. But we have been asked many questions with regard to the Militia and the Volunteers. My noble friend the Under-Secretary told the House that questions connected with the Militia organisation were at the present time under the consideration of a Departmental Committee sitting at the War Office. I am sorry I cannot give your Lordships more information in regard to that matter than has been presented by the noble Earl the Under-Secretary. The Secretary of State does contemplate introducing a Bill next year for the purpose, *inter alia*, of rendering the Militia liable for service abroad. That Bill will give to both Houses of Parliament the fullest possible opportunity for discussing the whole question of the organisation of the Militia. Lord Donoughmore asked how it came that I was likely to support, as he supposed I might support, a measure of this kind after the line I took last year in regard to the Bill then proposed by His Majesty's Government. He was wrong in accusing my noble friend the Under-Secretary of having voted against that Bill. The noble Earl says he did not vote against the Bill.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: But he did. I have looked up *Hansard*.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I am afraid I cannot settle that dispute. But, so far as I am concerned, I did vote against it, and I gave my reason in an Amendment which I had not the opportunity of moving. I voted against that Bill because I thought it was undesirable at that time to deal piecemeal with this question. I think so still, and you will not find when the Bill comes up next year that we are going to deal piecemeal with this question. You will then know the whole of our scheme in reference to the Militia. Last year we knew nothing. We were altogether in the dark. Mr. Arnold-Forster was supposod to have a scheme, but it never came definitely out whether it was the scheme of the Government or only the scheme of Mr. Arnold-Forster. The information before us was altogether insufficient, and therefore I did think on that occasion that it was undesirable to deal piecemeal with the matter.

I will give my noble friend opposite a little advantage. He missed one attack he might have made upon me. I did entertain last year grave doubts as to the propriety of enlisting the Militia to go abroad without further volunteering, but, of course, what is now proposed is to deal with the Militia on a new footing, to deal with them for purposes different from those for which they have hitherto existed. I am perfectly willing to accept the proposal if it is connected with a general reorganisation of the Militia upon an improved footing. No Act of Parliament can be passed with regard to the Militia without full opportunity being given for its discussion.

The real question underlying all these discussions of detail is this, are we to have a reduction of military expenditure or are we not? Lord Goschen was very displeased at the use of the word "mandate." I am an old-fashioned person, and I do not believe in the doctrine of mandate as it is sometimes put before us in these days; but if a mandate means that the people of this country made their opinions clear upon a particular point at a General Election then no doubt there was a mandate at the last General Election in favour of a reduction of expenditure. But it is not to please any of our supporters, it is not even to adopt the mandate of the country, that we think it our duty to propose relief of taxation in this form. We think that we owe it to the people of this country after the late war to do that which has been done, I believe, after every war this country has waged—namely, to afford to them a just and reasonable relief from the taxation that the war imposed. That is the principle upon which we desire to act; that is what we think is due to the people of this country; and that is what we intend to give to them.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am much obliged to the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for consenting to my Motion. I should like to observe, however, that while it is true that my right hon. friend Mr. Arnold-Forster proposed to reduce fourteen battalions, he absolutely refused to reduce them until he had something to put in their place. Mr. Arnold-Forster's position last year is exactly the position we say the Government ought to take up now. They have no right to make reductions until their other proposals are before the country. I would only add that if we were piecemeal last year somebody else is piecemeal now. With that I leave it.

On question, Motion agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock a.m., to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 24*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords] (by Order). Order for Third Reading read and discharged. Bill recommitted to the former Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

County of Durham Electric Power Supply (Re-committed) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).

Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Alkali, &c., Works Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill, without Amendment. Todmorden Corporation Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill; Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill; Middlesex County Council (General Powers) Bill; Derby Gas Bill; Cork City Railways and Works Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to, Portsmouth Water Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Bristol; Hoddesdon; Saltash; and, Walberswick; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; From Cole Orton (two); Conway; Coulsdon; Croscombe; Cucklington (two); St. Ishmael's; and Wandsworth (two); to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c., (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Two Petitions from Burry Port, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA (CONSTITUTION OF THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES).

Petition from coloured British subjects in South Africa, for enfranchisement of the coloured races; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

GENERAL PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Copy presented, of Order in Council approving of Rules made by the General Prisons Board, providing that certain privileges may be earned by Convicts through industry and good conduct in Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (UNITED KINGDOM).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1891 to 1905, Fifty-third Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage, and other Moneys between April 1st, 1905, and March 31st, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 280.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3679 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (BRITISH TROOPS).

Address for "Return of Disease among European Troops in India for the last ten years, showing yearly in reference to each regiment, battery, detachment, etc. (which has been in India for not less than four years), the strength, admissions to hospital per 1,000 for all forms of Disease, admissions to hospital per 1,000 for Contagious Disease, and the stations where such regiments, etc., have been quartered, also showing the annual average ratios for the period covered of all forms of Disease and of Contagious Disease."—(*Mr. Henry J. Wilson.*)

AUDIT OF COUNTY ACCOUNTS (IRELAND) (FEES).

Return ordered, "showing by counties the Fees recovered during the last financial year by the Local Government Board of Ireland from public bodies for auditing Accounts."—(*Mr Jeremiah MacVeagh.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Post Office Savings Bank—Unclaimed Balances.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in connection with the publication of a list of unclaimed balances to the credit of depositors in the Savings Bank Department on whose accounts no actual transactions, or no books forwarded for examination, have taken place for a certain number of years, he will, in order to obviate the erroneous or fictitious claims on the part of the legal representatives of deceased depositors, consider the advisability of publishing the surnames and initials only of these depositors, at the same time warning all applicants that unless they can furnish the Christian names in full as well as the occupations of such depositors their communications are liable to be ignored.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) As I informed the hon. Member on the 16th instant I am not prepared to sanction the publication of a list of the nature suggested. Any discussion as to the details of such a list or as to the method in which it should be used would therefore be of a purely academic character.

Appointment as Sorting Clerks of Messrs. Bicknell and Setter of Bristol.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Messrs. Bicknell and Setter, of Bristol, who passed the examination for sorting clerks in August, 1903, have been performing sorting clerks duties since May, 1905, with an interval of a few weeks; and whether, in view of the amount of overtime systematically worked by the sorting clerks at Bristol, he will explain why, in face of these facts, Messrs. Bicknell and Setter are told that their appointments as sorting clerks cannot be confirmed owing to overstaffing of the Bristol sorting office.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The postmen named by the hon. Member stand next for appointment. The delay, which I regret, has been caused by the fact that the number of places to be filled has been smaller than was anticipated when the examination was held.

Naval Warfare—Reserve of Heavy Guns.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the advantages battleships obtain after a naval action through being able to re-arm with new guns, the Board of Admiralty will take steps to obtain reliable information as to the reserve of heavy guns for each German battleship, and the use made by Japan of her reserve during the war, and specially as to whether the guns in German fortifications are standardised to the naval pattern, so forming a reserve for the Navy; and if it is found that a reserve is obtained by Germany much in excess of our own reserve of one heavy gun per ship, whether the Board will take steps to increase our reserve.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The reserve of guns for the Navy has been carefully discussed and is considered adequate, and the reserve of guns in foreign navies has not determined what should be the proportion of our reserves.

Foreign Naval Shipbuilding Programme.

Mr. BEAUCHAMP (Suffolk, Lowestoft): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can give the designed speeds of all or any of the battleships and armoured cruisers building or about to be built in France, Germany, Japan, and the United States?

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) I regret that it is not possible to give the information for which the hon. Member asks.

Improvement of Anstruther Harbour—Suggested Government Grant.

Mr. A. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he has received representations regarding the improvement of Anstruther Harbour and the necessity for financial assistance from the Government to enable the works to be undertaken; and whether he can now state the intentions of the Treasury with regard to the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I have carefully considered the representations recently made by a deputation from the burgh of Anstruther; but having regard to the conditions which have been insisted on in other cases of a like kind I fear that the amount of the local contributions forthcoming at Anstruther would preclude the Treasury from entertaining the proposals of the Harbour Board in their present form. If an amended scheme were produced I should be happy to give further consideration to the matter.

Charges for Long Distance Private Telephone Wires.

Mr. A. WILLIAMSON: To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the amount of the charge for private telephone wires between Liverpool and London, what the charge now is, what percentage it is upon the actual cost, and if the charge is intentionally restrictive; if he can now see his way to reconsider the scale of charges for private telephone and telegraph wires between the chief cities so as to promote the trade of the country?

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Owing to the increasing congestion of the routes available for overhead lines between London and Liverpool and other large cities in the United Kingdom, it became evident some time ago that the provision of any considerable number of long private wires would involve a very large expenditure in the rearrangement of the existing telegraph system, and in the establishment of new routes, involving serious wayleave difficulties, and might impede the proper development of the public service. It was therefore necessary to adopt the present tariff, which was designed to secure some return on the large expenditure indirectly involved in this class of business. I am not prepared, therefore, to provide double wire telephone circuits for private use at lower rates, but I am considering a scheme under which telegraph, as distinct from telephone, circuits might be provided on moderate terms; and I shall be glad if the hon. Member will inform me of any cases in which such circuits are likely to be required.

Irish Midwives and Colonial Appointments.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies has his attention been called to the injury resulting to the high reputation in obstetric knowledge enjoyed by qualified Irish midwives through the insertion in Colonial official advertisements of the requirement that the new certificate, legalised in England for the first time in 1902, is a *sine qua non;* will he inquire whether pledges were given in this House when the Midwives Act, 1902, was allowed to pass to the effect that the much older Irish qualification would not be prejudiced; and will he then inform each Colonial Government of the facts, and that after the passing of the Midwives Act the new English board refused their certificates to qualified Irish midwives unless they came to England and passed fresh examinations, involving more than ten days absence from home and heavy expense.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I fear I have no knowledge of the circumstances referred to in my hon. friend's Question. I gather from it that some of the Colonies are following a certain rule or practice laid down in England, and it seems to me that whatever exception is taken should be to that rule or practice, and that the Secretary of State can hardly instruct or advise the Colonies not to follow it as long as it exists in this country.

Temporary Clerkships in Dublin Government Offices.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that many second division clerks temporarily appointed to departments in the first instance are afterwards made permanent, and that the present system is liable to abuse in the Dublin Government offices, inasmuch as it gives power to heads of departments to send back to the Civil Service Commissioners clerks on the ground that their employment is only temporary, he will give instructions to the Civil Service Commissioners that they are in future to investigate all requests from Irish Offices for temporary second division clerks with a view to ascertaining beforehand whether such employment is really only temporary or whether it is likely to be permanent with a view to ultimate special treatment.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Civil Service Commissioners, with whom rests the final responsibility for making these appointments under Clause 7 of the Order in Council of November 29th, 1898, inform me that they have no reason to doubt the *bona fides* of the requisitions which they have received from Irish departments for second division clerks on temporary duty, and I think that no special representation to the Commissioners, such as is suggested, is necessary.

Transfer of Civil Servants Between London, Edinburgh and Dublin.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of instructing the Civil Service Commissioners to keep a list of second division clerks serving in the various Government departments in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin, who may be desirous of transfer from one of these capitals to the other; and whether he will give instructions that facilities be given to such clerks to have their names placed on such list.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Transfers of second division clerks require the consent of the heads of the departments from and to which the clerk is transferred, and the Civil Service Commissioners hold the opinion, in which I concur, that the initiative in these cases should be left as at present in the hands of the departments concerned. The Commissioners have, however, expressed their readiness to receive the names of any clerks desiring transfer from one capital to another provided that any clerk desiring to have his name placed upon that list sent in, together with his request, the written consent of the authorities of his department to his transfer, should it be possible The Commissioners desire it to be understood, however, that they cannot take the initiative in arranging transfers.

Irish Midwives Practising in England.

MR. T. M. HEALY: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department is he aware that the Midwives Act as at present administered by the Central Midwives Board is being employed as a means of preventing Irish midwives from practising in England, although when the Act was passed Irish representatives were given a distinct guarantee by the promoter that nurses trained in the Irish maternity hospitals would be in no way affected by it; will he inquire whether it is the fact that fully trained and certificated Irish hospital midwives have now to cross over to England and spend ten days in that country in order to pass the qualifying examination of the Central Midwives Board, and that but few nurses can spare the time and money to do this; have the Central Midwives Board refused to allow examinations to be held in Ireland, though the Irish Midwives Association have guaranteed to defray the expenses of the same; and is he aware that Colonial authorities are advertising that the English central midwives certificate must be possessed by midwives seeking appointments in the Colonies, thus excluding women with Irish qualifications.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am not aware that the Central Midwives Board is taking any such action as is suggested in the first part of the Question. The Midwives Act, 1902, does not apply to Scotland or Ireland, but my right hon. friend the Lord President of the Council informs me that the Central Board have never refused to recognise the Irish midwifery qualifications. During the operation of Section 2 of the Act three Irish midwifery qualifications, in addition to the three mentioned in the Act, were recognised by the Board as entitling their holders to claim the benefits of that section. As to the question of the holding of examinations in Ireland, the Central Midwives Board consider that they have no power to conduct examinations except at centres in England and Wales, but the Lord President of the Council is taking the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown upon the legal point involved. No such advertisements as those to which the hon. Member refers in the last sentence of his Question have been brought to my notice.

Appointment of Overseers at Byker, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what action, if any, he proposes to take with reference to the recent appointment of overseers for the township of Byker, Newcastle-on-Tyne, seeing that the magistrates, although they had the names of four duly qualified gentlemen submitted to them, appointed a gentleman, Mr. Nixon, who was not duly qualified through not residing in the township of Byker, and the vestry meeting having refused to pass the usual resolution requesting the magistrates to consider his nomination.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have no information as to the grounds upon which the justices acted in this matter, or any authority to take action with regard to it. If the appointment of Mr. Nixon was illegal it could only be set aside by a Court of Law.

State-Aided and Public Elementary Schools.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the compensation payable to certificated teachers on account of diminution of salary for which, under Clause 26, the local education authority is to be liable by reason of a school ceasing to be a public elementary school, he can state whether a school on becoming a State-aided school under Clause 4 ceases to be a public elementary school.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In the unlikely event of the case suggested in the Question arising compensation will be payable, as the school, on becoming a State-aided school, will cease to be a public elementary school for this purpose.

Books and Apparatus for Denominational Religious Instruction.

MR. A. ALLEN: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether under Clause 10 of the Education Bill it will be incumbent on the local education authority to provide, free of charge, the books and apparatus necessary for the denominational religious instruction to be given in the schools temporarily taken over.

(*Answered by Mr Birrell.*) The point raised in the Question concerns very closely the question upon which the Court of Appeal is shortly to give judgment; and I am, therefore, not prepared in these circumstances to offer an opinion.

Welsh Education—Transfer of Officials from Board of Education to Treasury.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the President of the Board of Education what is the approximate number and *status* of officials to be transferred from the Board of Education to the Treasury in respect of Welsh education.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not prepared to make any statement yet upon this matter.

Income Tax on Joint Stock and Co-Operative Societies.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will arrange that the non-assessment (total or partial) to income tax of limited liability, joint stock, Civil Service, Army and Navy, and co-operative societies will be considered by the Income Tax Committee now sitting, seeing that the evidence laid before the Income Tax Committee in December 1904, by Mr. Robert Walker on behalf of a considerable number of federations and associations of traders was not reported on by the 1904 Committee; and what steps he is going to take to have this subject inquired into.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I hope the Select Committee will be in a position to report on the matters referred to it very shortly, and I do not think it is desirable to enlarge its terms of reference in the manner suggested by my hon. friend. The Question seems to me to have been dealt with quite fully in the Report of the Ritchie Committee, and I am satisfied with their conclusions and do not propose to take any steps to institute a further inquiry.

Commissioners of Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education, Ireland, under what authority the present arrangement exists, who appoints these Commissioners, and under what authority, and who has the power of dismissing any or all of them, and under what authority.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Intermediate Education Board for Ireland is a body corporate established under the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Acts, 1878 to 1900. Each member of the Board is appointed by warrant under the hand of the Lord-Lieutenant, and under the terms of the statutes holds office during the pleasure of the Lord-Lieutenant. The names of the existing members of the Board are as follows:—

Right Hon. C. Palles.
Rev. W. Todd Martin.
Most Rev. Archbishop Walsh, D.D.
Right Hon. Mr. Justice Madden.
Samuel Dill, Esq.
Rev. T. A. Finlay, M.A., F.R.U.I.
Right Rev. Gerald Molloy, D.D.
W. J. M. Starkie, Esq., M.A., D.Litt.
Rev. John B. Mahaffy, D.D., F.T.C.D.
Francis A. Tarleton, Esq, LL.D., F.S.C.D.
His Honour Judge Craig.
Bertram C. A. Windle, Esq., D.Sc., M.D., F.R.S.

Royal Irish Constabulary Inspectors.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the inspectorate of the Royal Irish Constabulary has been largely recruited by limited competition amongst candidates nominated by the Lord-Lieutenant; will he say whether such a system is in vogue in Great Britain; and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of filling the higher ranks in the Royal Irish Constabulary by the same method as obtains in Great Britain.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) One half of the vacancies in the ranks of district inspectors of the Royal Irish Constabulary are filled by competition, conducted by the Civil Service Commissioners, among gentlemen nominated by the Government, and the other half by promotion from the ranks of the force. I am aware that this system does not obtain in Great Britain. It is, however, to be remembered that in the Royal Irish Constabulary promotitions from the rank of district inspectors are made to county inspectorships, and from the latter the Assistant Inspectors General and other high officers are appointed. In Great Britain the appointment of chief constable is, I understand, generally, if not always, made from the outside. The Government do not think it desirable at present to consider any change in the system of appointing district inspectors.

Sale of Miss Somers' Farm at Streamstown.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what grounds the Estates Commissioners refused to sanction the sale by Miss Somers of a farm at Streamstown, county Westmeath, to Michael Tracey, of the same place; whether the Commissioners had before them the fact that the farm was held by the father of the present tenant, which he lost through embarrassed circumstances; and whether, in view of the object of the Act, he will ask the Commissioners to reconsider their decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that it is not the case that they refused to sanction the sale in the case of Michael Tracey, a tenant on the estate of Miss Anne Somers. An agreement was signed for purchase at a price of £121. The Commissioners sanctioned an advance of £69, and the balance of £52 having been lodged on behalf of the tenant, the holding was vested in him on May 11th, 1905.

Schools "under Two Teachers."

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the expression a school under two teachers in the last syllabus of the Commissioners of National Education for Ireland, included a school conducted by a certified teacher and junior assistant mistress; and whether nature study by the same syllabus is compulsory in all rural national schools, and is it the intention of the Commissioners immediately to supply rural national schools with microscopes for that purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. Nature study is not compulsory. I am sensible of its importance. The Commissioners tell me that they have no funds from which they could supply national schools with microscopes.

Flooding of the River Barrow.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution adopted by the Mountmellick Town Commissioners at their meeting on the 3rd instant with reference to the state of the River Barrow, and expressing apprehension as to the effect of the approaching autumn and winter floods, judging from previous experiences; and will he say what he proposes doing to remedy or mitigate this long standing evil.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The resolution referred to has been received and will have attention. I understand that the Arterial Drainage Commission will sit at Portarlington next month, and take evidence from persons residing in Mountmellick and other districts adjoining the River Barrow.

The Artillery Reserve.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the present strength of the Artillery Reserve; what will be the number of trained gunners and drivers necessary on mobilisation to bring up the establishment of the proposed new four-gun and two-gun batteries of Royal Field Artillery and also of the Royal Horse Artillery to war strength, and to meet the probable requirements of India during the first year of the war; what provision, in view of the proposed immediate reduction of 3,800 men of the artillery, he proposes to make to meet the probable requirements of the artillery at Home and in India on mobilisation with respect to both horses and men during the period in which he is training his garrison Militia and Volunteers to take the place of Regular soldiers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The present strength of the Artillery Reserve is 14,743. To bring the fourteenth Royal Horse Artillery and ninety-ninth Field Artillery batteries to war strength 12,078 reservists would be required. It is not expedient in Imperial interests to give any figures as regards Indian requirements. As regards the last part of the Question the 3,800 men will not be immediately reduced, but will be gradually absorbed by drafts and wastage and by premature passage to the reserve. The steps to be taken as regards the Militia in the interval are now under consideration. Horses would have to be purchased as at present.

Irish Midwives in Military Hospitals.

MR. T. M. HEALY: To ask the Secretary of State for War upon what principle did the the recent advertisement for a midwife for the Curragh Camp prescribe the qualification of an English certificate under the Midwives Act; is he aware that Ireland was excluded from that Act solely because the then existing Irish qualification was so high that the Act was unnecessary in Ireland; will the War Department take care that in future the Irish as well as the English qualification for midwives shall be prescribed in their advertisements; and can he say by what means the Government were induced to officially discredit the Irish midwives qualification at the Curragh, having regard to the pledges given when the Act was passed, that the high position of Irish nurses should not be prejudiced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) All nurses appointed to military families hospitals are liable to be moved to any part of the United Kingdom, and those holding an Irish qualification are ineligible to practice in England after 1910 unless registered in that country. Considerable difficulties therefore arise from the appointment of a nurse who cannot be employed in English hospitals. The nurse who was accepted for this appointment held an Irish qualification and was specially selected from a large number of candidates.

The Milita and Compulsory Service Abroad.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he proposes to introduce legislation making it obligatory on the Militia to serve abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is proposed to introduce a Bill on the lines of that introduced by the late Government, making the Militia liable for service abroad on embodiment on account of imminent national danger or great emergency.

Army — Boys Enlisted as Tailors and Shoemakers — Continuing at Trade on attaining Eighteen Years of age.

MR. A. ALLEN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether boys enlisted into the Army as tailors or shoemakers continue at their trade after attaining the age of eighteen, or are then merged into the ordinary rank and file.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Such boys, when they become men, count in the rank and file establishment, but they can continue to work at their trades and generally do, as they can earn extra emolument by so doing.

Unemployed Grant—Provision for Scotland.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that £200,000 is to be provided for the unemployed in England and Wales, will he state what provision is to be made for the unemployed in Scotland.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The £200,000 is intended to be provide for the purposes of the Unemployed Workmen Act in the United Kingdom. Any sum which may be allocated to Scotland would have to come out of the £200,000, and I understand that my right hon. friend, the President of the Local Government Board, is in communication with my right hon. friend, the Secretary for Scotland, on the subject.

Irish Midwives.

MR. T. M. HEALY: To ask the Prime Minister is he aware that although Dublin contains the largest and oldest chartered school of midwifery in the empire, and the second largest in the world, the profession of midwife in Ireland, which has been organised for more than 150 years, has been gravely prejudiced by the action of a newly constituted body in England (which is not yet four years old), in refusing to recognise the Irish midwifery qualification, and inducing Government Departments to stipulate in advertisements that the new English qualification will alone be recognised; is he aware that the Irish midwifery schools, which now attract students not only from Great Britain and the Colonies but from the Continent and the United States, have without effect protested against the slur officially cast upon the older Irish qualification; will he inquire whether the English Central Midwives Board refuse to hold any examination in Ireland (although guaranteed the expense), so as to handicap Irish midwives, and put them to the outlay of a ten days visit to England; and, if so, will the Government allow The Midwives Act, 1902, which was passed with the consent of all Parties, to remain in force.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) My information is that the Central Midwives Board have not refused to recognise the Irish midwifery qualifications, nor have they induced, or endeavoured to induce, Government Departments to stipulate in advertisements that the qualification of their own certificate would alone be recognised. As to the refusal of the Board to hold examinations in Ireland, of which the hon. Member complains, I am advised that by the terms of the Statute such examinations cannot be held in Ireland.

Business at Saturday Sitting.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Prime Minister, what Scotch business he intends to take on Saturday next.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The business taken on Saturday will be the Second Reading of the National Galleries (Scotland) Bill, the introduction of the Crofters Bill, and the Report stage of the Fatal Accidents (Scotland) Bill.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

His Majesty's Ship "Montagu."

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the approximate daily cost of the salvage operations on His Majesty's ship "Montagu;" and what is the approximate amount that has been expended thereon up to date.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): I have nothing to add to my reply to a similar Question from the hon. Member for Yarmouth on July 19th.†

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) asked what would be the probable outcome of the operations.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said they were hopeful that the next attempt, to be made on August 6th, would be successful.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham): Is it not the fact some contractors are receiving £500 in connection with these operations?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That is the very question I have refused to answer.

MR. JENKINS: Is there the remotest chance of the salvage of the vessel being successfully accomplished?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have just said I hoped so.

The Proposed Reduction of the Army.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what, excluding artillery, is the actual reduction of present numbers involved by his reduction of the establishment by 20,000 men; and by what number the Infantry, Guards, and Line, on the Home establishment, fell short of establishment on June 1st and July 1st.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The reduction of approximately 20,000 men is a reduction of establishments. The effect of the reduction on the numbers at present serving cannot be stated until the arrangements for disposing of existing men have been completely worked out. As regards the last part of the Question, on the dates mentioned the Foot Guards were respectively forty-four and eighty-two over establishment, and the infanty of the line 4,031 and 4,092 under establishment.

The Guards.

MR. GUY BARING (Winchester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when it is proposed to reduce the Guards' battalions at Aldershot from four to two.

MR. HALDANE: It is not possible at present to give a reply to this Question.

MR. GUY BARING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is intended to give the Guards' brigade that would be mobilised in case of war any training at Aldershot?

MR. HALDANE: Two battalions of Foot Guards will be quartered and trained at Aldershot and will form part of the 1st Brigade. A brigade of four battalions of Foot Guards will be quartered in London, and will, on mobilisation, form part of the 2nd Division. This brigade will, whenever possible, train at Aldershot for a few weeks in the autumn.

The Identification of Bambaata.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the general officer commanding the troops in Natal has made any adverse report upon the conduct of Major Pratt, R.A.M.C., in respect of his action in connection with the steps taken to identify the body of Bambaata; if so, will an inquiry be held so that Major Pratt may have an opportunity of meeting the charges which have been brought against him.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxi., 379.

MR. HALDANE: The Major Pratt alluded to does not belong to the Royal Army Medical Corps.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): Does the officer whose name has been mentioned in connection with this matter belong to any branch of His Majesty's service?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot answer that Question without notice.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I will put it down.

British Garrison in Egypt.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what compensation had to be paid for reducing the British garrison in Egypt last year; and if General Slade, who was deprived of his office by such reduction, will be appointed again to the command now that the garrison has to be greatly increased?

MR. HALDANE: Only one officer was deprived of staff employment for a very short period by the reduction, and he was granted compensation for this loss. Major-General Slade was not deprived of his command in Egypt owing to the reduction, but because he reached the age of sixty-two on the 16th March, 1905, and had therefore to be placed on retired pay in accordance with the provisions of the Royal Warrant.

Army Council.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the Army Council came unanimously to a definite resolution that there were 20,000 too many men in the Regular Army in the present situation of Imperial affairs, and in such case if he will give the date and terms of the Resolution and the names of the persons present at such Council.

MR. HALDANE: If what the hon. and gallant Member means is to ask for the details of what passed at particular Army Councils, I must decline on principle to furnish the information. The proceedings at such Councils are and must be of a confidential character. All the information that it would be proper for me to give as regards the view of the Army Council was contained in the speech delivered by me in the House on the 12th instant. †

SIR HOWARD VINCENT pointed out that the names of Ministers attending Cabinet Councils were published, and asked why the names of persons attending the meetings of the Army Council should not also be given to the Press.

MR. HALDANE: I do not know by what authority the names of Ministers attending Cabinet Councils are published, but I do not propose to extend the practice to the Army Council.

The Militia.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what proof he can give the House that the 30,000 Militiamen necessary for his expeditionary force of 154,000 men will be forthcoming on the declaration of war; and if he can name the regiments which have undertaken to furnish these 30,000 men in units of not less strength than one company, and the names of the commanding officers who have given this pledge, and the evidence of validity they have been able to adduce to the Army Council.

MR. HALDANE: What I said in my speech on the 12th instant was that the War Office proposed to obtain the Militiamen necessary for the striking force. Steps are already being taken with a view to carrying this proposal into effect. In due time hereafter the hon. and gallant Member will have his opportunity of judging whether they have proved successful.

Sparkbrook Factory.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to the fact that a number of the Sparkbrook employees whose services have been dispensed with owing to the sale of the factory have been refused employment by the private firm to whom the factory had been sold; and whether, in view of the understanding arrived at between the Government and the firm with regard to the re-employment of these men, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 1075, *et seq.*

MR. HALDANE: I am not aware of the matter mentioned. Will my hon. friend be good enough to send me specific instances to enable me to make any inquiries which may be necessary?

Ordnance Factory Employees' Privileges.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War from what fund the privileges given to workmen employed in Government ordnance factories is provided for sick, epidemic, accident, medical, and holidays; and if any special sum is assessed to working and management expenses for such purpose.

MR. HALDANE: There is no special fund for the purpose. The cost of these privileges is charged against the output of the ordnance factories, and forms a portion of the general indirect charges on the work done in them.

Rifle Manufacture Contracts.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, with orders given to private manufacturers for Lee-Enfield short modified rifles, there is any understanding or contract with such firms to take a number of rifles which during the process of manufacture may have been rendered defective for first-class purposes, and fail to pass the viewers, and which are used for the purpose of drill practice; and if there is such an understanding or contract to take a number of these defective rifles, what is the number in proportion to orders given, and what is the price paid for them.

MR. HALDANE: There is no such understanding, but contracts have been made last year and this year for drill pattern rifles as required. 2,200 were ordered in 1905–6, or 1·6 per cent. of the service short rifles ordered up to same date, and 950 in 1906–7, or 1·6 per cent. of service rifles ordered in same year. The contract price is 40s. each.

Political Agents in Native States of India.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, in reference to the replies of his predecessors on the 25th June, 1903, and the 19th February, 1904, whether he has yet received from the Government of India the information promised as to how many of the native States of India, the territory of which exceeds 100 square miles, are, or up to the date promised were, under the administrative control of political agents on account of the infancy or incapacity of the chiefs of such States, and what has been the increase in their number during five years; and whether he has any objection to the information so obtained being printed and circulated as a Parliamentary Return.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. JOHN ELLIS, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): The information referred to by the hon. Member has been received. The Secretary of State has no objection to laying it on the Table of the House if he will move for it.

Pearl Separating Machinery.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Mr. Dixon's pearl separating machinery was working well in 1904; whether Sir H. Blake, the Governor of Ceylon, recommended the sale of this machinery to the Gulf Syndicate at Rs. 161,529; and whether, and under what circumstances, it was sold to the Ceylon Pearl Fisheries Company for only Rs. 120,000.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): As to the first part of this Question I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave yesterday on this subject.† The first draft of the lease as approved by the Ceylon Government, which is given in the Blue-book, included purchase of Mr. Dixon's apparatus, etc., for Rs. 161,529. This sum included not only the cost of machinery but the whole expenses incurred by the Ceylon Government in connection with the matter, including Mr. Dixon's salary and travelling expenses, wages of assistants, workmen, etc. In the course of the negotiations in this country the representatives of the Syndicate demurred to this charge, and asked that they should pay at a valuation of the apparatus by someone in the Ceylon Public Works department. Eventually, with the concurrence of Sir Henry Blake, who was in England at the time, the sum of Rs.120,000 was agreed upon as a compromise, the actual cost of the machinery, as stated yesterday, having been Rs. 76,689.

---

† See Col. 712.

British East African Protectorate Currency.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will take into consideration the advisability of substituting British coinage for Indian in the British East African Protectorate, a change desired by the Mombasa Chamber of Commerce, the Colonists Association of British East Africa, and practically the whole white community.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The matter to which the hon. Member refers was very carefully considered by the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs some two years ago, and the conclusion arrived at was that, in view of the close relations of the Protectorate with India, the balance of advantage lay in the retention of the rupee; and the Secretary of State for the Colonies has seen no reason to vary that decision. The British sovereign has, however, now been declared legal tender, and an issue of rupee notes of convenient denominations has been made.

Trinidad Legislative Council.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the wholly elective principle can be extended to the replacement of the unofficial Members of the Legislature, in keeping with the policy of allowing the people a greater share in the administration of their own affairs, inasmuch as, under the system now in vogue in Trinidad, unofficial Members of that body represent only themselves, and are not in touch with the real desires of the taxpayers of the Colonies.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State cannot accept the statement that the nominated unofficial Members of the Legislative Council represent only themselves, and he is not prepared to replace them by elected members.

Gambling and Crime in the Transvaal.

Mr. MOND (Chester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in view of the statement made by Lord Selborne, in the Blue Book [Cd. 3025], that the outrages caused by Chinese coolies are mainly due to ruined gamblers among these men, the Government will so cause the Ordinance to be amended as to make gambling an offence punishable thereunder.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Transvaal Statute Book already contains provision with regard to gambling, but it is doubtful whether the evil can be successfully dealt with by legislation. It is hoped to reduce it by stricter control on the mines.

White Labour in Transvaal Mines

Mr. MOND: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware of the trials that are being made with unskilled white labour on the Nourse Deep and other mines; and whether the Government will take steps to obtain a report from the Government mining engineer on these trials.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have no special information as to these trials, but the Governor is being asked to obtain a report from the Government mining engineer on any such experiments.

Port of Spain Borough Council.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware of the petition sent to the Colonial Office by the people of Trinidad, through the Workingmen's Association in Port of Spain, praying for the establishment of the wholly elective principle in the election of the borough council; and in view of the favourable opinions expressed by the present Governor of this Colony, he can say whether approval is to be given, and if so, when.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The petition was duly received and acknowledged. After consulting the Governor, the Secretary of State has decided that there shall be for two years a board nominated by the

Governor which shall take over the duties of the three existing municipal authorities, and that at the end of the two years the question whether the existing board shall be continued or shall be replaced either at once or gradually by an elected board shall be again submitted to the Legislative Council.

Trinidad Finance.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in view of the deficit shown in the Estimates of the Colony of Trinidad for this year, and the already high rate of taxation upon foodstuffs, etc., which inflicts hardship on the poorest people, he will suggest a policy of retrenchment curtailing all salaries over £200 per annum, and a suspension of the sum of money paid annually from the Revenue of the Colony for coolie immigration.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Estimates for the current year do not show a deficit, but a surplus. The Secretary of State is not aware that the taxation upon foodstuffs in Trinidad is felt to be oppressive, and he does not consider that the interests of the Colony would be served by reducing salaries and suspending the Vote for immigration.

The "Knight Commander."

MR. HART-DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has as yet received any reply from the Russian Government as to the personal compensation claimed by the captain and crew of the s.s. "Knight Commander," and if not, when some settlement of this claim may be expected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The claims of the master and crew of the "Knight Commander" are included in the general claim put forward for the loss of the vessel. His Majesty's Government have, within the last few weeks, again pressed the claim upon the Russian Government, but hitherto without success.

Baghdad Railway.

MR. HART-DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to make any statement as to the proposed Baghdad Railway; whether, in the event of the railway being prolonged to the Persian Gulf, he will consider the advisability of this extension being financed by British capitalists; and whether any negotiations are going on as to the proposed alternative termini of Koweit and Klor Abdullah.

SIR EDWARD GREY: No negotiations are proceeding with His Majesty's Government in regard to the Baghdad Railway, and I have therefore no statement to make regarding it.

Turkish Customs Duties.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government will include in any fresh negotiations for an increase in the customs duties in Turkey which may be proposed by the Porte a condition regulating, in accordance with the needs of keeping order in Macedonia, the military expenditure to be included in the budget of that province; when he will present papers to Parliament dealing with the recent negotiations which culminated in the rejection by the Porte of the proposals of the Powers; and whether he will communicate to Parliament the conditions which it is intended to substitute for those which have been rejected.

SIR EDWARD GREY: It is not possible to lay papers or to make a statement giving the details of negotiations which are now under consideration, and in which other Powers are concerned. I may, however, say generally that His Majesty's Government require to be assured that certain arrangements for which they originally stipulated in the interests of commerce will be carried out by the Porte, and also that an effective guarantee will be given to ensure that the proceeds of any increase of the Customs dues will be available for and applied to the scheme of reforms in Macedonia.

Case of Mr. Stannard.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the action of the Governor-General of the Congo Free State and also the sentence of the court in the case of Mr. Stannard, he will further consider the advisability of pressing for the establishment of consular jurisdiction as speedily as possible.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I hear by telegraph that Vice-Consul Armstrong was satisfied with the way in which the trial was conducted, but his report has not yet been received, and an appeal has been made against the sentence, the result of which cannot yet be known. We cannot at this stage found any further action upon this case.

Factory Acts—Particulars Section.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Reports on brush-making, india-rubber balloon making, and net-making, mentioned in His Majesty's Chief Inspector's Report for 1902 as already or about to be specially reported on with a view to their inclusion in the operation of the particulars section, have yet been submitted to him as a result of the further inquiries he proposed to have made.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): Reports on brush-making, net-making and a number of other industries have been made, and are now under consideration. The reports on the india-rubber trade generally (including toy balloon making) and on one or two other industries are not yet quite completed. It will be desirable, I think, to deal with those of the industries investigated to which the application of the provision as to particulars is found to be required, at the same time and, if possible, by a single comprehensive order.

Accidents Returns.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if he will consider the expediency of calling on the police throughout the country to prepare and transmit to the Home Office monthly a record of all accidents coming within their cognisance, showing in how many instances such accidents have caused personal injuries, and in how many cases deaths have resulted therefrom.

*MR. GLADSTONE: It would be impossible for the police to make general Returns of all accidents. It is possible that they might be able to supply annual Returns of traffic accidents, but I am not prepared to ask for such Returns, involving as they would heavy clerical labour, unless I am satisfied that they would serve some important public purpose.

Vanguard Bus Odours.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the Vanguard motor omnibuses plying in the Metropolitan area emit vapour of an offensive odour, which has been denounced by Professor Sir James Dewar as detrimental to public health; and, seeing that this constitutes a public nuisance, will he communicate with the company with a view to the abatement of this nuisance.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to refer my hon. friend to the Answer I gave him yesterday on this subject.

In reply to a further Question the right hon. Gentleman said that until the result of the expert's inquiries was received by him he could make no communication to the Vanguard Company.

Motor Traffic Casualties.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department having regard to the fact that although inquiries were set on foot last year to ascertain whether a Return of the casualties caused by motor cars, motor cycles, and motor omnibuses could be collected from the police throughout the country, no complete figures have been obtained; will he give the figures so far as they go; and will the police be instructed to prepare and transmit to the Home Office monthly a record of all accidents caused through motor traffic coming within their knowledge, the number of cases of personal injuries resulting from such accidents, and the number of deaths.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Inquiries were made last year by my predecessor, but the conclusion arrived at was that it would be difficult for the police to make the Returns and that they would be very incomplete. On the other hand the Registrar-General gives complete Returns of deaths from motor accidents, and on April 3rd last, in reply to a Question, I gave the figures for 1903 and 1904. The figures for 1905 will be ready shortly. It would be quite impracticable to call for a monthly Return of motor accidents from nearly 200 police forces.

Death from Anthrax at Bradford.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that a man named Charles James, of 7, Bierley Lane, Bradford, recently died from anthrax, which he had contracted whilst employed at the firm of Messrs. William Scriven and Company, of Bradford; and whether, in view of the frequency of these cases he will take action under The Public Health Act, 1875, Section 130, and deal with dangerous wool at the port of entry.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I have seen a newspaper report of the inquest in the case referred to. There would be difficulties in dealing with dangerous wool at a port of entry, and it has been thought better to rely on precautions to be taken at the factories where the wool can be sorted. Regulations for the process of wool-sorting and wool-combing were made by my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, in December last, which it is hoped will do much to lessen the risks incurred by the workers, but the matter is still engaging his anxious attention.

MR. JOWETT: Have not steps similar to those indicated in the Question been taken in other cases?

*MR. JOHN BURNS said he was informed by those better qualified to form an opinion than himself that wool sorting could best be done in the factory as there it was easier to secure better sorting and better inspection.

Cost of Pauper Children.

MR. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the approximate cost per annum, including charges on capital account, of the maintenance under the poor law system of each child in barrack schools, village communities, scattered homes, and under the boarding-out system; and what is the approximate number of children provided for in each of the above-named classes of institution.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The returns do not enable me to give all the information asked for, and in particular they do not include in the cost of maintenance capital charges or the salaries of officers. But I may state that on January 1st, 1905, there were in district and separate schools in England and Wales 12,134 children, and that the cost of maintenance in the year ended March, 1905, was £150,774. The number in cottage, scattered and other homes was 13,971, and the cost of maintenance £144,446, whilst the number boarded-out was 8,620 and the cost of maintenance £92,080.

MR. LIEF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): How does that cost compare with the cost of the children maintained in workhouses?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Roughly speaking, the cost in district schools was £12 10s., in cottage, scattered and other homes, £10 10s., and of those boarded-out £11 10s. In the workhouses the cost would be cheaper still.

Ireland and the Unemployed Relief Grant.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what proportion of the sum of £200,000 which the Government intend to spend for the relief of the unemployed during next winter will be spent in Ireland.

MR. JOHN BURNS: This point is not at present settled. I am in communication with my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on the subject.

Grants to Distress Committees.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when money grants have been paid to the various distress committees from the £200,000 proposed to be granted by the Government, whether the various distress committees will be able to give a share of employment to people who register their names, irrespective of whether they have received

Poor Law relief for the previous twelve months or not.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The conditions which must be satisfied by an applicant to a distress committee will remain as at present. The receipt by the Committee of a sum out of the grant will make no difference in this respect.

Wheathampstead School.

Mr. H. R. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the case of the Wheathampstead Church of England School, the sanitary condition of which, notwithstanding reports of the County Council Surveyor and resolutions of the Education Committee, has been left unimproved; is he aware of the overcrowding of the school and of the illness amongst the scholars, and of the proximity of the closets to the school; and, seeing that in consequence of the overcrowding, a portion of the school is conducted during part of the year in a corrugated iron shed, open on one side to the weather, and unapproachable in time of rain, whether the President of the Board of Education will secure that necessary improvements be made without delay; and whether the fine of £1 inflicted upon a parent named Lawrence for the absence from school of his child will be remitted, seeing that the child was kept at home by illness attributed to the condition of the school.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.): In regard to the first two paragraphs of the Question, I have to say that the sanitary condition of this school has for some time been under consideration by the Board of Education, and a special visit by the Board's architect was paid by my instructions, with the result that a letter was sent to the Authority on June 20th pointing out certain matters which would require to be dealt with. It appeared, however, at that visit, that the state of things in respect of the premises was not so bad as would appear from the description given in the Question put to me in this House on May 11th last† or in the Question from the hon. Member to-day. I understand that the offices are not considered to be detrimental to health from their position, but that some improvements are needed which have been named to the Authority in the Board's letter above referred to. The Board have no knowledge of the use of a corrugated iron shed for teaching purposes, as alleged in the Question. In regard to the two concluding paragraphs of the Question, the Board have no knowledge of any fine having been inflicted upon a parent, as stated in the Question. But I will see that a second letter is sent to the local authority to-day, requiring the prompt carrying out of the alterations previously named by the Board.

School Examiners.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, under existing Civil Service regulations, the Government has the power to transfer, without their consent, examiners now serving under the Board of Education to a separate Department to be constituted under Part III. of the Education Bill.

Mr. LOUGH: I am not in a position to give any authoritative opinion as to the power of the Government in regard to the duties which may be required of Civil servants, nor as to the power of the Government in respect of transferring Civil servants from one Department to another; and, as no question of the kind has yet arisen in respect of my Department in regard to the matter referred to by the hon. Member, I do not see any reason for going into it at this juncture.

Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Society.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the attempt now being made by the Committee of the Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Society to turn this society, which at present is constituted as a mutual society under the Friendly Societies Acts, into a limited liability company; and, seeing that such change can only be effected by a vote of the members of the society, whether he will take steps to ensure an opportunity to each member to record his vote.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 39.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): My attention has been drawn to this proposal on the part of the Friendly Society, but I am informed that the Chief Registrar has no power of interference beyond that of calling a special meeting conferred upon him (subject to Treasury consent) under Section 76 of the Friendly Societies Act of 1896.

Kew Gardens Workers.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, why, seeing that all sections of workers in Kew Gardens have represented their grievances to the noble Lord in the form of a memorial, thereby complying with his wishes, specifically showing that the rates of pay were below that paid to similar workers in the public parks in the district; that the hours worked did not compare favourably with the latter; and asking the noble Lord to receive a deputation from the men's federation, why an answer to the points raised in the memorial has not been sent to the men's representative.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somerset, S.): The memorial in question was referred to the Treasury, who sanctioned the payment of increased wages to certain classes of the men employed at Kew, and authorised the employment of an additional stoker in order to carry out a reduction in their hours of labour. The decision of the Treasury has been communicated to the men, and will be carried into effect at once. If there are any further points which the men desire to bring under the notice of my noble friend, he will be glad to give them every consideration, and, if necessary, to arrange an interview with representatives of the particular classes concerned.

Sutherlandshire Main Roads.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Congested Districts Board can do anything by way of a grant or otherwise to improve the condition of the main roads in Sutherlandshire.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Congested Districts Board have not been able to see their way to make grants for the improvement of main roads, as maintenance in a condition for traffic is a duty imposed on the Statutory Road Authority.

Island of Lewis Fisheries.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if the Congested Districts Board will consider the expediency of providing grants in aid of the construction of boat hauling winches at some of the fishing villages in the Island of Lewis, where there are at present no facilities for hauling boats.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Congested Districts Board will take into consideration any such applications that may reach them.

Unemployment Committees in Scotland.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state how many county councils in Scotland have formed unemployment committees.

MR. SINCLAIR: Only one county council in Scotland has taken action under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, viz., that of Lanark, where a special committee for the whole county has been established in terms of Section 2 (3). In addition, the County Council of Kirkcudbright are represented on the Central Body established in terms of Section 2 (2) of the said Act for the Burgh of Dalbeattie.

Crime in County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the recent address of Lord Justice Fitzgibbon to the grand jury of the county Longford, in which he congratulated them upon the peaceful state of their county; and whether, having regard to the fact that a sentence of three years' penal servitude was inflicted at the previous assizes on a man named James M'Cann for an alleged Whiteboy offence, the Crown will take into account the peaceful character of the county and extend clemency to M'Cann by reducing the sentence imposed on him.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): My right hon. and learned friend has asked me to reply to this Question. I have received a report of Lord Justice Fitzgibbon's address, which fully bears out the hon. Member's description of it. As to the remainder of the Question, I beg to refer to my reply to the hon. Member's previous Question of June 28th.† It is, as I then informed the hon. Member, open to the convict or any one on his behalf to forward a memorial at any time to the Lord-Lieutenant, and such memorial will be laid before the Lord-Lieutenant for his decision. I am sure that His Excellency will take as lenient a view of the case as it is possible for him to do consistently with the interests of justice.

Irish Exports.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state if the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, with a view to the development of Irish trade, will undertake the compilation and publication of a complete list of the exporters of Irish manufactures and produce; and, if so, whether the co-operation of the various industrial development associations will be invited so as to secure that the publication will be complete in every respect; and will he arrange that the publication be in English, French, German, and Spanish, so that it may be placed with advantage in all consular offices, and in other centres of commercial enterprise abroad.

MR. BRYCE: The Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction are in sympathy with the proposal referred to in the Question, and are considering how far they may be able to further the object in view. Even with the assistance of the Industrial Development Associations, which the Department would welcome, the scheme would involve considerable expense, and some additional clerical assistance would be required. If the Department should be able to obtain these, they will endeavour to give effect to the proposal.

Amalgamation of Irish Unions.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Report of the Royal Commission on Amalgamation of Unions, promised in April last, has been presented to the Lord-Lieutenant; and, if not, whether, seeing that the matter urgently affects the county of Clare, owing to the overcrowded state of the lunatic asylum there, and, in view of the resolution passed by the county council over four months ago asking to have this Report presented, can he state the reason for the delay which is causing much misery to the insane in that county.

MR. BRYCE: The Report has not yet been presented. As to the reason for delay, I beg to refer to my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for East Kerry yesterday.‡ I understand that the Commissioners will recommend in their Report that a workhouse in county Clare should be placed at the disposal of the lunatic asylum authorities.

Cooscroum Landing Stage.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board is now prepared to give proper landing facilities at Cooscroum, county Kerry.

MR. BRYCE: The Congested Districts Board at their last meeting considered the question of improving the landing place at Cooscroum in conjunction with the proposal for the erection of a pier at Reenard Point in the same district. The Board decided that they would be prepared to make a liberal contribution towards the work at Cooscroum if funds should be provided from other sources for erecting a pier at Reenard. As the Board's funds are limited, they cannot undertake to contribute to both of these expensive works. The possibility of otherwise providing funds for works at Reenard is under consideration.

Portarlington Police Barracks.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Cloneygowan, King's County, police station is only three miles distant from Kilmalogue, Portarlington, police barrack; and, seeing that Kilmalogue constitutes the part of the town of Portarlington situate in King's County, whether he will say what reason exists for continuing two police barracks and eleven policemen in Portarlington, the population of which is under 2,000 inhabitants?

---

† See (4) *Debates,* clix., 1149, 1150.

‡ See Col. 693.

*MR. BRYCE: The Inspector-General of Constabulary informs me that Cloneygowan police district is four miles from Kilmalogue police station. As to the remainder of the Question, I beg to refer to my reply to the hon. Member's similar Question on 17th inst.† There are not two police stations in Portarlington. The Portarlington station and the extensive rural district attached to it are in Queen's County. The Kilmalogue station and the district belonging to it are in King's County. The Inspector-General considers that there is full necessity for each of these stations.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. Delany—

*MR. BRYCE said that although the two police stations were comparatively close together, the districts they served stretched far and wide.

Irish Poor Law Commission Report.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the delay of the Poor Law Commission (Ireland) in presenting their Report, and the inconvenience caused thereby to many public boards in Ireland, he will lay upon the Table the Correspondence he has had with the Commissioners on the subject?

*MR. BRYCE: I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to the Question on this subject put by the Hon. Member for East Kerry yesterday,‡ when I fully explained the circumstances which have led to delay in the presentation of the Report referred to. It would be contrary to the established practice to lay upon the Table any correspondence which may pass between the Government and the Commissioners in such case.

Police and the Johnstown Schoolhouse.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the proceedings instituted by the police against a licensed trader at the petty sessions of Johnstown, county Kilkenny, and of the fact that it was sworn in the evidence by the police that they were concealed all night in the National schoolhouse facing the residence of the trader in question; whether he can state who gave the police authority to break the lock and force an entrance into this parochial building for such a proceeding; and whether it was with the sanction of their superior officer that the police acted in this manner.

*MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that upon the hearing of the case referred to the prosecuting policemen proved that they were concealed in the national schoolhouse from half-past three in the morning until midday, when they detected the offence. The police did not break the lock or force an entrance into the schoolhouse, but had full authority to enter. The offence, of which the publican was convicted, was that of keeping his house open for sale at prohibited hours on Sunday.

MR MEAGHER: When I go home next week I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give me authority to hold a political meeting in the schoolhouse.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Longford Magistracy.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of magistrates appointed in county Longford from July 31st, 1895, to December 1st, 1906; how many of the gentlemen so appointed were Protestants and how many Catholics; what is the existing proportion between these denominations on the magisterial roll of the county as a whole; and whether it is proposed to redress the balance by appointing additional Catholics to the commission of the peace for the county.

*MR. BRYCE: The Lord Chancellor informs me that the number of magistrates appointed for the county Longford between July 31st, 1895, and December 1st last is twenty-seven, of whom twenty are Protestants and seven are Roman Catholics. The present Lord Chancellor has since appointed four additional magistrates who are Catholics. The total number of ordinary magistrates in the county is sixty-seven, of whom forty-one are Protestants and twenty-six are Catholics. The Lord Chancellor is, he informs me, always ready to consider the names of any persons who may be suggested to him as suitable for the magistracy.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxi., 37.

‡ See Col. 693.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is it not the fact that the Lord Chancellor considers the names in conjunction with the Lord-Lieutenant of the county, who is known to be a rabid Tory?

[No Answer was returned.]

River Deel.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Irish Board of Works, whether he is aware that the River Deel has not been cleaned for the past ten years, notwithstanding the formation of the Milford, county Cork, Drainage Board, with the result that the tenants' lands are badly flooded at frequent intervals; have the occupiers of these lands complained to the Board of Works, and, if so, with what result; can he say what explanation do the Drainage Board put forward for this neglect to carry out the necessary cleaning and drainage of the river; and will he say who constitute this Drainage Board and who are responsible for neglect of this work; and what steps the Board of Works propose to take in order to remedy a state of things which causes loss to occupiers of land in this district.

MR. McKENNA: The Milford Drainage Board, when they are in being, are responsible for the maintenance of these works, but I am informed that no Board has been elected since 1895. A complaint has been received from the occupiers, but the Commissioners of Public Works, Ireland, have been advised that in the circumstances they have no power to execute works of maintenance. Repeated efforts to secure the election of a new Drainage Board having proved unsuccessful, the Board of Works in February, 1905, brought the matter before the Local Government Board with a view to the transfer under the Local Government Act, 1898, of the district to the county council, who would then be able to deal with the necessary work of maintenance. I am not aware, however, that the council has taken any steps in the direction of a transfer.

MR. FLYNN: Can the Board of Works do nothing to remedy this state of things?

MR. McKENNA: No, so far as I am aware.

Irish National School Plans.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware of the inconvenience caused by the delay in publishing the new plans for national schools in Ireland; and whether there is any prospect of their publication in the near future.

MR. McKENNA: I regret that I have nothing yet to add to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for North Longford on the 19th ultimo. That Answer ran as follows: "No settlement has yet been reached, I am sorry to say. The Commissioners of National Education having objected to the new plans prepared by the Board of Works at the instance of the Treasury, the Commissioners have now been asked to submit for the consideration of the Irish Government and the Treasury their own suggestions for plans for schools to be built in future years."

MR. BOLAND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this matter has now been going on for four years.

MR. McKENNA: Yes, and we are now awaiting the plans of the National Board.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Whose fault is it there has been so much delay?

MR. McKENNA: I have my views and I dare say the National Board have theirs.

MR. FLAVIN: Why not express them?

Drumlish Letter Deliveries.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that in connection with the extension of a midday post to Drumlish the rural carrier merely delivers the bag and returns immediately, giving no time for reply to letters received by the English mail being answered the same day; and whether with a view to giving the full benefit of the improved service to the people, an arrangement will be made by which the carrier will remain for two hours in the village so as to enable replies to be written and forwarded to letters received by this delivery.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): It is the fact that the postman who takes the midday letters to Drumlish does not wait at that place to allow an interval for reply, and arrangements could not be made for affording such an interval except at increased expense. As the hon. Member is aware, the cost of the midday service to Drumlish lately granted, was itself not in strictness warranted, and I regret that I should not be justified in incurring further expenditure on the post.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the increased expense would only be 5d. per day. Does he know that since the service was established there has been a considerable increase of correspondence?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: If as is stated there has been a large increase in consequence of the improved facilities I will reconsider the matter.

Tinehaly Post Office Medical Officer.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he has concluded his inquiry as to whether Dr. Bolster is a fit and proper person to be appointed medical officer of the Tinahely post office; whether he has applied to the guardians of the Shillelagh union for information as to their experience of Dr. Bolster as dispensary doctor; and, if so, what conclusion has he come to.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have not yet been able to complete the inquiry referred to.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Will a decision be come to before the adjournment of the House?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I fear I can give no promise.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Then will it go over to October?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Oh, no; as soon as I hear I will communicate with the hon. Member.

Irish Trade Statistics.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the importance to Irish industries of accurate statistics of exports and imports from and into the ports of Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Waterford, Limerick, Sligo, and other Irish ports, whether the Customs authorities will be instructed to furnish weekly Returns of the imports and exports of the sea-borne traffic, both foreign and coasting, on the lines of the Returns given for the trade of Cork up to the years 1878 or 1879.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Bills of Entry on the lines of the former Cork Returns are already compiled and published with respect to Dublin. I understand that the Customs authorities would be prepared to compile similar Bills of Entry for any of the other ports named, provided that a sufficient number of subscribers desired to obtain the information. I should add, however, that Returns of this nature would be of little use for statistical purposes except as regards coal, grain, or dutiable goods, and that there is no power to require full and accurate statistics of goods carried between Ireland and Great Britain.

MR. FLYNN: Could not the Custom House authorities make arrangements with the steamship owners in the various ports by which accurate Returns may be obtained as was done in Cork up to a very recent date?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I should like that Question to be addressed to the Treasury, as the Customs are not under the control of the Board of Trade. I am informed that legislation would be necessary.

Welsh Disestablishment.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the promise that the Government will introduce a measure to emancipate the Church in Wales from State control in the course of the third session of this Parliament is conditional on the Report of the Royal Commission being received in time; and, if so, can he represent to the chairman of the Commission the desirability of issuing the Report before the close of next year.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I am not aware of any such promise as my hon. friend alludes to in his Question, and it is not necessary or advisable to make any representation on the subject to the chairman of the Royal Commission.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Then do I understand that the President of the Board of Trade had not the authority of his colleagues in the speech he made?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware of any such speech.

High Sheriffs.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Prime Minister by whom or on whose nomination names are placed on the list from which the high sheriffs are pricked; whether the right to suggest names or to nominate is given by statute; and whether, in view of the duties attaching to the office of high sheriff, he will consider the desirability of vesting the right of nomination either in Members of Parliament or, if not, then in the county or borough councils.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Names are placed on the list, from which the high sheriffs are pricked, by certain great officers and others of the Privy Council sitting together with the Judges of the High Court of Justice, in accordance with Section 6 (1) of the Sheriffs Act, 1887. By ancient custom sheriffs hand to the senior Judges at the summer assize each year a list of gentlemen eligible and the Judges present give in the name or names necessary to complete the number of three for each county to be placed on the roll for His Majesty to prick. The Government does not propose to recommend legislation on the subject.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the business for Saturday and the arrangement of the Irish Supply on Thursday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the first Order at Saturday's sitting would be the Second Reading of the National Galleries (Scotland) Bill, to be followed by the Bill to amend the Crofters Act and the Fatal Accidents (Scotland) Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Those three things?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: All purely Caledonian. In regard to Irish Supply, for Thursday, he did not think he could do better than follow, perhaps, the most illustrious example of a judgment, and divide the subject of controversy between the two Parties. He should propose to put down the Irish Local Government Board Vote first, and let that continue till the dinner hour, and then proceed to the Chief Secretary's Vote. That, he thought, would meet a not unreasonable wish of hon. Gentlemen opposite.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: And some Member of the Government will make the necessary Motion to enable this arrangement to be carried out?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, the transition will take place.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the arrangement with regard to the Irish Estimates had not been made with the concurrence of his colleagues and himself. They had protested and still protested against any arrangement which would seem to establish or justify the claim put forward on behalf of a small minority of the Irish Members to decide what Supply should be taken on the allotted days for Ireland. They resented very much the arrangement whereby they were precluded from raising some most urgent questions connected with education in

Ireland. They had no objection to discussing the Chief Secretary's salary—indeed, they welcomed the opportunity—but they desired to safeguard themselves against the establishment of a precedent contrary to what had been the invariable practice for many years.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said that acting on the suggestion of the Prime Minister, he and his friends did approach the hon. Member for Waterford, who refused to have any dealings with them. Perhaps the House would now understand their objection to a Home Rule Parliament.

MR. WEIR said the National Galleries (Scotland) Bill was a very contentious measure, and he suggested that it should be made third Order instead of first Order for Saturday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the Bill was a very small one and he did not think it need occupy very much time.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: At what hour will the House sit on Saturday?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Noon.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: And what is the business for Friday?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Navy Estimates, to be followed by the Trades Disputes Bill.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: No Caledonian business?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No.

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments, and with an Amended Title.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281.]

Minutes of the proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 281.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Friday, and to be printed, [Bill 323.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved to eliminate sub-section (2) of Clause 2. He said he did so in order to get an explanation of the Government's meaning. While the Bill was in Committee a new clause, viz., Clause 22, was added which provided that the owners of a transferred voluntary school should give to local education authorities the right to use on not more than three days in the week any room in their schoolhouse out of school hours for any educational purpose, if in the opinion of the authority or, in case of dispute, in the opinion of the Board of Education, there was no suitable accommodation for the purpose in schoolhouses belonging to the authority. In view of the provisions contained in this clause he felt justified in moving to leave out sub-section (2) of Clause 2. There was no hint that the spirit of the trust should not be broken, though of course he knew, and he thought the House knew, that the vast majority of the trustees and owners were anxious to carry out these trusts as far as was possible in conformity with the spirit of the law. The right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education had put down three Amendments to the sub-section which, if carried, would make it read to the effect that owners should have power to use the schoolhouse or permit it to be used either in consideration of a payment or free of charge for any purpose of public or social utility. As he understood it a schoolhouse might be used for such purposes as political meetings or lectures and matters of that kind. He did not wish to quarrel with such a provision as that, but he would go further and take the right hon. Gentleman's third Amendment. If that were carried the section would read:—

> "Subject nevertheless to any statutory provisions under which the use of the schoolhouse or any room therein may be required for public or educational purposes."

What he would like to know was what was meant by "educational purposes?" He presumed that it referred to the new Clause 22. He asked whether the use of the schools upon those three days by the local education authority would be paid for by that authority, and whether the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment referred to Clause 22?

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out sub-section (2) of Clause 2."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'for,' in line 13, stand part of the Bill."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said that the whole idea of the Government was to assist the owners of school premises. There was at present grave doubt whether trustees could let their premises for money unless authorised by their trust. He had heard that owners and trustees were very willing to let their schools be used for purposes of educational value, and to relieve the *tedium vitae* of the villages. The latter part of the clause was put in entirely with the object of relieving owners and trustees from certain legal restrictions which prevented them from using or permitting the use of their premises for the purposes mentioned on receipt of payment. It was not proposed that the premises should be used for vulgar purposes, but for purposes which came within the purview of public and social utility. The word "educational" had been put in in consequence of the new Clause 22. Everyone would admit that it would be a great misfortune if the arrangement made under the Act of 1902 was not carried on, and evening continuation classes, etc., were to be suspended because of the new Bill. Consequently this had been made the subject matter of fresh arrangement. The Amendments were brought forward in order to secure the validity of Clause 22 which gave local authorities the right to use any room in the school-house on three days in the week. The question of monetary terms were to be settled, in case of dispute, by the Board of Education.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) suggested that the Amendment of the hon. Member might be withdrawn, and the matter left until they came to Clause 22.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BIRRELL formally moved, "In Clause 2, page 2, line 13, after the word 'school-house' to insert the words 'or permit it to be used either in consideration of a payment or free of charge.'"

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'school-house,' to insert the words 'or permit it to be used either in consideration of a payment or free of charge.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. BIRRELL moved to insert after the word "purposes" the words "of public or social utility."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'purposes,' to insert the words 'of public or social utility.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) thought the words just inserted were unduly wide in their scope. He had no wish to repeat the discussions in Committee, but he would suggest that some such words as "not incongruous with the trusts upon which the school-house is held," should be added. Trustees were not, he knew, the kind of people to disregard their trusts if they could help it, but the clause might be used as a lever. It would be a serious step to allow trustees the ability to break the remnant of these trusts and use the school-house for other purposes which might not be in accordance with the spirit of the trust. The real object, he took it, was not to open the door to a wholesale disregard of trusts, but rather to create a machinery for the carrying out of those trusts to the best advantage. He would formally move those words.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'not incongruous with the trusts on which the schoolhouse is held.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) desired to enforce what had fallen from the noble Lord. There was really no difference of policy in this matter between his noble friend and the Government. They were all agreed that the trust should be broken as little as possible, and they wanted to prevent the letter of the trust intervening between the use of the schoolhouse for certain social purposes. A schoolhouse often lay derelict for many hours during which it might perfectly well be used for purposes of public or social utility. What they really wanted to do was to take care that after the purposes of the trust had been fulfilled the schoolhouse should be available for the remainder of the twenty-four hours for other purposes which would in no way contravene the letter of the trust. They did not want in any way to interfere with the intentions of the owners, but if the purposes of the trust had been fulfilled in the school, the remaining hours might be utilised for other purposes not inconsistent with the trust or detrimental to its operation. He thought the Government would sympathise with the view the noble Lord had put before the House, and he could not help thinking that if the Government would accept the addition proposed it would carry out their object with greater regard for the trusts than the Bill at present proposed. Hon. Members on both sides of the House were not divided in their views upon the matter, or if there was any division of opinion it was only as to the method by which these views should be put into effect.

MR. BIRRELL said he was a little frightened at the possible effect of the noble Lord's words, although he agreed with the object he had in view. He thought the words proposed by the noble Lord, however, were not necessary. He was once a lawyer, and the words "not incongruous with the trusts" suggested to his mind the possibility of some hedge lawyer raising a troublesome point which he did not honestly believe would ever be raised in respect of the use of these schools out of school hours. A cantankerous person—and he supposed he should get into trouble for suggesting that there were such—who had been offended by something said in a lecture, might raise trouble under these words. Though he entirely agreed with the noble Lord and would willingly accept these words, for his own part, he was bound to say that they frightened him. Having regard to the common sense which did dominate this country, outside the House of Commons at any rate, he thought the Amendment might be dispensed with.

LORD R. CECIL asked leave to withdraw the Amendment in view of the sympathy expressed by the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said these schoolhouses were very often used in the evenings for entertainments, and on Sundays and other days for religious services. A cantankerous ratepayer might conceivably object to these cases, and he thought words ought to be inserted into the Bill which would prevent the limiting of the use of the room in a way in which both he and the right hon. Gentleman would deplore.

MR. BIRRELL did not think that the words would limit the user of the school, and he was quite sure that they would not prohibit the proper use by owners of their own premises.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BIRRELL moved to insert the words "or educational" after the word "public," in the subsection which provides that the use of the schoolhouse out of school hours shall be subject "to any statutory provisions under which the use of the schoolhouse or any room therein may be required for public purposes."

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'public,' to insert the words 'or educational.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That these words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) moved an Amendment, framed on the terms of Subsection (4) of Clause 4, to provide that where an agreement for transfer was refused by the local authority or by the owners, there should be an appeal to the

Board of Education to continue the school as a State-aided school, the appeal to be granted if inquiry satisfied the Board of Education that there was in the neighbourhood another school where Cowper-Temple teaching was given; that the schoolhouse was structurally suitable; and that the owners were in a position to carry on the school as an efficient elementary school with the aid of a Parliamentary grant. He said that the proposal was to restore the conditions existing prior to 1902 for those schools which wished to avail themselves of them. That proposal could not inflict any grievance on the Nonconformists, nor could it lead to inefficiency, for the grant would be payable only on the ground of efficiency. It would secure full public control, through the Board of Education and the House, for the taxpayers' money only would be spent on these schools. He wished to transfer this provision from Clause 4 to Clause 2, because in the former clause it was subject to safeguards introduced for quite a different purpose. The financial test which he proposed on the claim of a school to become a State-aided school was in itself enough without any numerical test of the parents desiring the change. If the managers were willing to run the risk of dispensing with rate aid, and could prove that their school was efficient, there was no reason why they should be thwarted. After all, these schools were the private property of the denominations. Were not people to be allowed to use the school they had built with their own money unless they first went through some conjuring trick with a ballot-box? The taxpayers' money, like the ratepayers', came not exclusively from Nonconformist pockets. Catholics, heretics, and Jews all paid rates and taxes; and if their money were taken for other people's schools they had a right to demand back other people's money for their own schools. He could not see any answer to that simple proposition of financial justice. He believed that the majority of the Liberal Party regarded religious equality as one of its great principles, and he believed that was also the view of many Nonconformists. He was convinced that the Nonconformists wished to play fair with their opponents, and he believed that many of them were beginning to realise that they ran the same danger as the Church Party ran and incurred in 1902. The Act of 1902 was dictated by the Church Party and they saw the results in this Bill. Were they quite sure that the present action of the Nonconformists would not have the same result five or six years hence? By common consent the Nonconformists were suffering a grievance in the single school districts, but this Amendment did not touch those districts. It was specially limited to districts where there was a Cowper-Temple school available in the neighbourhood. He admitted that in single school districts there must be an average type of school to suit the average type of mind. But when they had an opportunity of variety why should they not be allowed to have variety? Why should not the Jews and the Roman Catholics have the type of school they desired if they were ready to put down the money for it? Lancashire, which led the van in industrial enterprise, was also the county which had the greatest number of voluntary schools, which showed that the people of that county, at least, favoured variety. The right hon. Gentleman had charterised a recent speech of his as a voice from the grave. He did not quite understand the grave which the right hon. Gentleman had in his mind. If his right hon. friend meant that he was expressing the stock views of the Liberal Party of thirty years ago, then he said that that grave contained many of the noblest men of our race, and he would be proud, indeed, if any words of his appeared merely as a faint echo of their utterances. He was inclined to think, however, that the phrase had a more personal meaning. His right hon. friend, like himself, was brought up in a school that taught that the Liberal Party stood for religious equality and for equal justice between man and man; and he wondered whether his right hon. friend in using that phrase meant only to express his regret at the contrast between those youthful ideals and present realities.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) in seconding the Amendment said he could not see any reason why it should not be accepted. He was in the Education Department for many years, and had had to run a good many grant aided-schools. It had been said that if the Amendment were carried the schools would be bad again and the children would suffer as they did in the old days. But if the managers took an interest in the schools and the inspectors did their duty the schools would be carried on perfectly efficiently under the proposal. The safeguard was that if they were not carried on efficiently they would cease to exist, as the Parliamentary grants would be withheld.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 20, at the end, to insert the words, 'If the local education authority refuse to agree to any arrangement offered to them as respects the use of a schoolhouse by the owners thereof, or if the owners of a schoolhouse refuse to agree to any arrangement as respects the use of the schoolhouse offered to them by the local education authority, the owners of the schoolhouse may appeal to the Board of Education to continue the school as a State-aided school, and the Board shall grant the appeal provided that—(*a*) there is in the neighbourhood another school where religious teaching in accordance with Section 14 of the Education Act of 1870 is given; (*b*) that the schoolhouse is structurally suitable for a school; (*c*) that the owners of the schoolhouse are, in the opinion of the Board, in a position to carry on the school as an efficient elementary school with the aid of a Parliamentary grant as hereinafter defined. The Board shall from time to time examine every such State-aided school in order to ascertain whether the buildings are maintained in a sanitary and otherwise suitable condition and whether elementary secular education is being efficiently given. If these conditions are found to be satisfied the Board shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, pay to that school, although it is not a school provided by the local education authority, the Parliamentary grants which would be payable in respect of the school or the scholars in the school if it was a school so provided.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said that if this Amendment were accepted it would let any denominational school stand outside the Act and go back to the position which it occupied before 1902. He thought the hon. Member for Preston was not entitled to taunt him for championing the teachers, because, after all, it was not an ignoble championship on his part. He admitted the teachers were created for the children and not the children for the teachers. He also thought the taunt of the hon. Gentleman with regard to religious liberty and the Liberal Party was an unworthy taunt. The mover of the Amendment appeared to have forgotten that if his proposal were accepted the schools would have to live on their present grants. On the Report Stage of the Bill it was impossible to propose an increase of the Government grant. He would give figures to show how absurd the proposal was. The proposal had evidently been made in the interests of Catholic schools: therefore he would take the figures of the Catholic schools in three districts. In Manchester the children at such schools cost £4 4s. each, and of that only £1 19s. 7½d. came from the Government grant. Was it conceivable that the poor Roman Catholics of Manchester could raise voluntarily the sum of £2 4s. 4½d. per child which, with the Government grant, would be the sum necessary to maintain these schools at their present level of efficiency? Similarly in Southampton each child cost £4 6s. 11d. and only £1 19s. 9d. was contributed by the Government, and in Bristol each child cost £3 12s. 1d., of which only £2 0s. 6½d. came from the grant. The House would thus see how much the supporters of these schools would have to raise from voluntary contributions. It would be absolutely impossible for the people interested to maintain their schools efficiently with the present Government grants. The proposal was perfectly preposterous, and its sole effect would be the shutting of the schools.

*SIR **HENRY CRAIK** (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that when the Bill was in Committee he moved a contracting out power under Clause 1. That was a much larger and more liberal proposal than this and he remembered that for doing so he incurred the very severe censure of the hon. Member for North Camberwell. He regretted to incur that censure, but he felt sure that the hon. Member knew enough of his work and of his aims in connection with education to believe that in moving his Amendment he certainly did not intend to starve the voluntary schools. He shared strongly the hon. Member's sympathies with regard to the teachers, and if he thought that contracting out was likely in any way to injure the teaching profession it would not receive any support from him. He should support the Motion before the House not because he thought it liberal enough, nor because he accepted all its details, but because the principle which it embodied commanded his assent. His own Amendment was negatived, but it was somewhat strange that since the debate the Government had been forced to admit the principle of contracting out, and it could no longer be said that there would only be one type of school under the Bill. The Government had climbed down from that position, and had admitted State-aided schools. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman could not with consistency adopt the same attitude as he did with regard to the original Amendment which he moved upon a previous occasion. The Government had now admitted contracting out under Clause 4, and why then should they refuse it under Clauses 2 and 3? One of the very central principles in the Act of 1870 and in the Act of 1872 in Scotland, and in every subsequent statute dealing with education, had been that the Education Department was to pay grants irrespective of whether the schools were supported by the rate-collecting authority or not. Now they were entirely reversing that order of things, and they were closing the door of the State to a type of schools which might not commend themselves to this or that local authority, but which, nevertheless, might be doing the work which the State demanded, and therefore had the right to receive the assistance which had hitherto been given by the State all round and without regard of persons. What would be the result of the rejection of the Amendment? Did the Government imagine that they were going to close the doors of all schools except those that were carried on under the local authorities? Was that the wish of this House? Were they going to follow the example of France and attempt to close the door of every voluntary and private school? If not, was it not the wisest course to keep the hold of those schools which they now possessed by the public inspection of the Board of Education? Were they not running the risk of driving a great many schools out of the national system, thus exempting them from public inspection and the benefit of the light and the efficiency that public inspection gave? Surely they were not anxious to follow the example of some other countries. What had happened under the American system? In America 1,500,000 children were driven out of the public schools, and were now being educated in the parochial schools, with no assistance from public grants or the local rates. Did hon Members opposite imagine that the feeling in England to preserve the voluntary schools was not as strong as it was in America if they were driven to extremities? Those who favoured this Amendment were anxious to keep up the independent and religious character of education, and by forcing these schools to come under the local authority they ran the danger of cutting them adrift altogether from the national system of education. Were they wise in driving them to adopt that course, the result of which would be that the national system of education would be narrowed as an inevitable consequence? It was the same in some of our Colonies. Nothing struck him more in South Africa than the serious fact that a very large and important part of the education there was going into the hands of the Roman Catholics. These Roman Catholic schools had no assistance from the local rates or public grants, and although they considered that they had been unjustly treated in being refused all assistance from the public taxes it made no difference to them in carrying on their schools. He ventured to prophesy that that example would be followed out in this country. They would run serious risk of failing to keep up their national system if they attempted to force all the schools into one mould and to place them under one authority. For those reasons he should support the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Preston.

Sir Henry Craik.

MR. BIRRELL said he was sure his hon. friend the Member for Preston would not be surprised when he told him that he could not accept the Amendment. The State-aided schools had come into existence as a by-product, which he regretted, of the Bill. They sprang entirely from denominations and from denominational desires. They had no other source, no other object. Seeking, as the Government did, to protect denominational interests under certain very stringent conditions, they felt it might be that after they had been so set up they might find it impossible to get the extended facilities continued from the local authority, and that, therefore, it was necessary to allow them the loophole and refuge of this system of State-aid, cutting them off altogether from rate-aid. It was a melancholy necessity, and he hoped it would be found, owing to the good sense and liberality of the local authorities, that it would very seldom happen. The hon. Gentleman opposite who represented some Scottish Universities anticipated with great confidence a breakdown of Clause 4 altogether. He did not agree with the hon. Gentleman, for he did not believe that there would be a great number of schools which would resolutely stand outside the system which was sought to be imposed upon them by the Bill. He was perfectly certain that it was possible to discover for this country a system of national education which would secure both rate-aid and State aid for all its schools with, possibly, the exception of the Roman Catholics, the Jews, and a certain section of the Established Church. It was all very well saying that inspection would keep up schools; it was impossible. The inspectors of the Board of Education undoubtedly had two standards, although he did not suppose anyone authorised it. But they knew, as a matter of fact, that the inspectors did not press as heavily on the voluntary schools as they did on the board schools, because they knew that the latter, if pressure were put on them, could effect the necessary alterations, while the former might have to close their doors. However much they might put the screw on their inspectors, he was perfectly persuaded that they would not put the same pressure upon the school that received State aid only as they would on the school that received both State and rate aid. He was, therefore, compelled to come to the conclusion that schools of this description would not be so good structurally, and would not be so efficiently staffed. He could not regard without dismay anything approaching a general adoption in this country, as an alternative to our State and rate-aided schools, a kind of school which must be inferior, and his hon. friend would not, he suspected, be much surprised that he could not accept the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not discuss the difference between the new and the old Liberalism, though he dared say they would hear more of it before this Parliament came to an end. He thought the argument of the hon. Member for North Camberwell only amounted to this—that the Amendment was directed to the assistance of Roman Catholics and that no Roman Catholic schools would be rich enough to take advantage of it. If that were so they might leave that argument on one side because a loophole would be given of which no advantage could be taken. That was not a very formidable argument against the Amendment. He did not at all deny that there was force in the objection advanced by the Government, that by creating a category of State-aided schools they would create schools which were not up to the general level of efficiency in the country. But why, then, had they got these schools under Clause 4? How was it, if the Government held this view so strongly, that they would not accept this Amendment, that they had been forced to introduce into Clause 4 an exceptional class of schools? Why had the Government so derogated from its own ideas of education? The reason was plain, and lay on the surface of the Bill. If they abandoned, as they did in this Bill, the variety left in our schools by the Act of 1902, they were forced to go back, at least in part, to the variety left by the scheme of 1870. They were derogating from the level of educational efficiency established by the Act of 1902. They would no doubt give play to denominational requirements, but they would do so at the cost of education. He wondered whether it occurred to the right hon. Gentleman that since under Clause 4 he had accepted the class of school which he now denounced he was really condemning the whole measure. If the Government adhered to the scheme of the Bill that inevitably carried with it the acceptance of some such Amendment as this. He regretted the necessity. Throughout these discussions his colleagues and he had been denounced as having been animated by mere sectarian desire to benefit schools belonging to one or at most two denominations; but those who had studied the history of the Act of 1902 would do them a fuller measure of justice. That Act was fundamentally an Act for the improvement of education. They had to deal, of course, with the denominational question, but their object was to raise the level of education in every school in the country, denominational or undenominational. That Act did permit denominational schools to continue, and also raised the level of all schools throughout the country. Now, because the Government were determined that the denominationalists should not have fair play, they were driven to destroy the full educational merit of the Act of 1902. They had laid down the irrational and unjustifiable principle that no rate aid should be given to a school in which denominational teaching was given. And it was only in certain arbitrarily selected parts of the country that the denominational demand was to be considered worthy of attention. Why was it to be only in areas of 5,000 population? The right hon. Gentleman himself admitted that no solution of this question could be satisfactory which did not meet the needs at all events of Roman Catholics and a portion of the Anglican Church. Were those needs confined to districts of 5,000 inhabitants? Were they not co-extensive with the whole area of the country? Therefore the Government were bound to give the same outlet to these legitimate denominational wishes everywhere as was given to them in certain restricted areas under Clause 4. He agreed with his hon. friend that no systemof education was satisfactory which did not admit of variety. Under the Act of 1902 there was great variety. He hoped that even now local education authorities would more and more feel that one type of school was not suited to every district, and that there would be the different types of school essential under any satisfactory system. But the Government had abandoned that system; and Nemesis had overtaken them in the Amendment now before the House. A peaceful settlement of the question was to be found in the direction of accepting the Amendment rather than of rejecting it. He agreed that it was a choice between two evil things. He had not disguised from the House how he regarded the matter, and if the hon. Member for Preston went to a division, he would support him.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford,N.) said he would vote for the Amendment, although he did not go so far as the hon. Gentleman who moved it. He and his friends approved of the Amendment in the main, believing that it would be for the benefit of those schools which were excluded under the 5,000 limit. As far as they could gather, in view of the peculiar nature of the whole situation at the present time, this Amendment was consistent with the maintenance of those schools, and, therefore, he and the hon. Members with whom he was associated were in favour of it. They objected to the principle of contracting-out. They thought that it would be infinitely better if the Roman Catholic schools could remain within the provisions of the enactment, but at the same time they believed that the Amendment would do something to meet the case of a large number of schools which would be affected by the 5,000 limit. There were some who thought these schools in future would not receive the amount of Parliamentary grant which they were receiving at the present time.

DR. MACNAMARA: Why not?

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said that remained to be seen. On that question he preferred the argument of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. He believed they would not get more than half the grant they were getting at the present time. It was a choice between two evils, and on the whole he would rather support the Amendment.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said the word "concession" had been used in many of the debates. When the Government had found themselves in difficulties which they had brought upon themselves by going back on the principles laid down in the Act of 1902—

principles which were accepted by every expert educationist in this country—they said "Give the Opposition this concession." Those with whom he acted entirely repudiated that there was concession in anything that had been granted by the Minister for Education for the relief of the difficulties in which he had found himself. They had asked for justice and not for concessions. The Minister for Education had given the Opposition supporters of the voluntary schools what he called a concession in the principle of contracting out. Personally, he was entirely opposed to contracting out. He believed that a great many of his hon. friends accepted contracting out simply because it was the last resort. It was all they could get. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell that the Act of 1902 was at least sound and good in this respect, that it co-ordinated to a considerable extent our system of education, and that by putting schools on the rates, lifting the voluntary schools into a better state financially, and giving the constant inspection which was applied to the schools, it ensured a better educational system to this country. Though the Act of 1902 was attacked by hon. Gentlemen opposite with respect to its religious side, he believed that most of them were in agreement with it on its educational side. Being opposed to denominational education, they brought in this Bill which was not an education Bill, and then they attacked the religious side of the education carried on in the schools. This Bill was absolutely reactionary in its character. It had a retrograde tendency in that it was a return to the ante-1902 system. He ventured to say that the only real disability attaching to Nonconformists under the 1902 Act was in connection with the single school areas. In spite of all that had been said of that disability he estimated that not more than one per cent. of Nonconformists had suffered real disability or injury in the single school areas. This Bill would be admitted to be reactionary, though it might be, so far as the right hon. Gentleman was concerned, an advance in the relation of religious teaching to the education of the country. He would support the Amendment, not because he liked it, but in the same sense as he supported the contracting out clause. They were placed in such a position by the disabilities attached to this Bill that they must take what they could get, but they would not accept alterations as concessions. The contracting-out clause struck a blow at the educational system of the country. There might come a day when they would be able to reverse what the right hon. Gentleman had done. It would be done, as was done in 1902, as part of the system of education, and not as part of a scheme of devitalisation of the religious education of the children. When the time came, and it might come sooner than the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues thought, the Opposition would restore again to this country the step forward which was made by the Bill of 1902, adding to the efficiency and co-ordination of education.

*MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said that one great difficulty they had on the Ministerial side of the House who wished to speak in favour of removing certain hardships and restrictions which seemed to be imposed on the denominationalists, was that the concessions which had been offered by the Government to hon. Gentlemen opposite had been received in such a way that, in his opinion, the Government would be justified in making no more of them. Personally, he felt that the Bill had been drawn on the lines of compromise, and therefore he was inclined to welcome the Amendment of his hon. friend as tending to do away with certain hard cases which would not tend to the smooth working of the Bill and might even be regarded by some as the single school area grievance was in the 1902 Act.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland Division) said he really felt that in speaking at this stage of the Bill they were beating the air. Their chance of amending the Bill was not very bright. They must wait for another opportunity which he need not exactly specify, because everybody knew exactly what he meant. He thought that the Amendment of the hon. Member for

Preston—to whose abilities he paid tribute, and who, he hoped, would attain to higher position—was an admirable one, and he thought the hon. Gentleman was right in pressing his Amendment. At the same time, while saying that it was an Amendment which he approved of, that was not because he believed that it would prove a solution of the problem, but because it was a statement of principle. All parties in the House were agreed that so far as two minorities in this country were concerned—the Catholics and the Jews—their position was peculiar: first, because they were minorities; secondly, because they were small minorities; and thirdly, because they were in antagonism to the general opinion of the country, and that they, therefore, required special treatment. The Minister for Education, in introducing the Bill, had expressed that view with such admirable lucidity that it was received with popularity on all sides. But when the Minister for Education came to put into the shape of a clause the principle which he had enunciated he found himself face to face with a narrow, extreme, and it must be said, an intolerant section of the community of this country. His hon. friend the member for North Worcestershire had said that the reason why the Government could not give any more concessions was that the concessions they had already made had been received so badly. But in a bargain one could not expect that a purchaser would say to the seller, "You are offering your goods at an extremely moderate price." The right hon. Gentleman had declared that he was going to meet the Catholic and the Jewish grievances by making certain concessions, but it was found that those concessions, instead of making the position of the Catholics and the Jews better, had made it worse. There was the ballot, for instance. According to the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone, under the four-fifths clause the result would be that 90 per cent. of the children attending the schools would be excluded from having facilities given for religious instruction. He knew perfectly well that all these calculations were entirely different from those given by the Minister for Education, but he hoped up to the last moment that the Minister for Education would not stand hard and fast in regard to these limitations. He himself could not see the difference between a town school and a country school. Let them take some of the country districts in Lancashire. There were schools in those districts which had been kept up for generations by English Catholics, and it seemed to him that it had reached the extreme of intolerance that in those districts the distinctive religious teaching which had been given in the schools—every stone of which had been paid for by the people who remained fast to the faith of their fathers—should be withheld because the population was under 5,000. The final result of the clause would be that 50 per cent of the Catholic schools would be left out of the scope of this Bill. He acknowledged that the Minister for Education did not admit the accuracy of those figures. He admitted that the disparity of the number of schools and the disparity of the number of scholars was not the same; and the right hon. Gentleman held that 75 per cent of Catholic scholars would be protected. But supposing that statement to be true, why should 25 per cent of Catholic scholars be excluded from the benefits of free education because they did not reside in a district containing 5,000 inhabitants? But there was also the educational and economic aspect of this question. The minority for whom he spoke was, in most cases, drawn from the very poorest of the poor, and it was incredible that a democratic Administration in a democratic Parliament should sanction a fine on these people because of their religious convictions, and that the children should be placed in an inferior educational position because of the fidelity of their parents to their religious faith. What, then, was the Minister for Education going to do? Would he take upon himself the responsibility of leaving these schools in this position? As between pure secularism and Cowper-Templeism he said that Roman Catholics would sooner have pure secularism. Secularism was negative teaching, it was true, but Cowper-Templeism was bad, because it taught what was insufficient, and to the Roman Catholic mind the teaching was not only insufficient, but false. Among the many mysteries which were presented in considering this problem, the moral and religious distinction which men were able to draw between taxes and rates was to him the most remarkable. Some men would give any amount of money in the shape of taxes, even to the teaching of religious doctrine in which they did not believe, but they would declare that their religious conscience was outraged if they were asked to pay a penny in the shape of rates. He knew that this controversy had existed for a long time, and perhaps if only poor King Charles the First had been wise enough to levy his ship-money as a tax and not as a rate he might have retained his head and his Crown. For himself he did not understand this distinction, but his hon. friend had moved an Amendment to the effect that if these excluded schools could not be supported from the rates they should be supported from the taxes. If his hon. friend was able to show that he could give these schools as much money in the shape of taxes as they would in other circumstances get in the way of taxes and rates, then they would all join in supporting his Amendment which might be the solution of the question. Nobody believed that this Bill was a solution, and the whirligig of time might well produce other proposals. Some Roman Catholics, it was true, had advocated contracting-out, but he was strongly opposed to such a solution except as a *dernier ressort.* If the Amendment were adopted in its present form Roman Catholic schools in Manchester, Southampton, and Bristol would have to pay half the expense of educating the children, and, in addition, contribute their share of taxes and rates for the schools of other denominations. The hon. Member for North Camberwell, with his usual abundant generosity in supplying material to men of less experience than himself, had put before the House the figures in the places he had named. In Manchester the cost per child was four guineas; in Southampton, £4 6s. 11½d.; in Bristol, £3 12s. 1d. The grant to certain Catholic schools in those places was, in Manchester, £1 19s. 7½d.; in Southampton, £1 19s. 9d., and in Bristol, £2 0s. 6½d. The result would be that if this Amendment were accepted in its present form, in Manchester each one of the schools would have to make up out of the contributions of the Catholics, £2 4s. 4½d., in Southampton, £2 7s. 2½d., and in Bristol, £1 11s. 6½d. In other words, as he had said, roughly speaking, if the Amendment were carried, Roman Catholic schools would have to pay half the cost of educating their children. [Mr. LOUGH dissented]. These were official figures, and it was no use the hon. Gentleman shaking his head. These were the figures of the Minister for Education himself, and from them it appeared that the Catholics had to pay considerable sums for the education of their own children, in addition to paying taxes and rates for the education of other people's children. Yet in memorable words Dr. Clifford said, "Rome is on the rates." He did not think anybody could give a good reason for not paying his rates whether he was attached to Rome or Westminster. The county school supported out of the rates and taxes attended by the children of the wealthy Nonconformist shopkeepers and professional men was established on the highest educational basis that money could provide, and beside it the school of the poor Catholic docker, such as he represented, was a poor, miserable school, which the poor Catholic had to pay for out of his exiguous pocket. With regard to the principle laid down by hon. Members opposite that no man should pay for the religious education of a child with whose religious persuasion he did not agree, he would ask: Had not the Roman Catholic the same right to object to Protestant teaching as a Protestant had to object to Catholic teaching? This Amendment was a mitigation, and as a mitigation he accepted it. He accepted it also as a declaration of principle. But to hon. Members the meaning of this Amendment was that they had proved that neither the Minister nor the Bill had solved what they had always regarded as the most pathetic problem of the education of this country, and that they must look to other times, other ministers, other divisions, and other speeches for a solution of that problem

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich) expressed the opinion that this was the most retrograde proposal that had ever been made in connection with the Bill. When it was adopted, if it were adopted, under Clause 4 they would be establishing a class of schools which would always be labouring under a great grievance because they would be deprived of the rates, and yet the people who contributed to them would also be paying the rates. Hon. Members opposite condemned this Amendment on the ground that it was retrograde, and yet the Conservative Party were going to support it. That surely was not a logical position to take up. He was strongly of opinion, and he thought there were many Members of the Church Party who would agree with him, that Clause 4 was, as it stood, a good deal too drastic; that the four-fifths principle was arbitrary and exacting, and that the limitation of population to 5,000 was unnecessarily hard. If they could persuade the President of the Board of Education to reconsider the drafting of Clause 4 they might save themselves all this discussion in connection with the present Amendment. He belonged to that party of Churchmen which sat on the Liberal side of the House who had been lectured *ad nauseam* from below the gangway opposite and above it. If they thought for a moment that this Bill was harsh in its incidence to the Church there was not a Churchman sitting with him who would support it. He hoped this Amendment would not be supported by either side of the House.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said he had always regarded the State-aided schools as a regrettable incident in this Bill. He had frequently stated that the freedom and variety which might be attained by the State-aided schools would also be attained, with the additional advantage of popular control, by the exercise by the local authorities of their new powers in adapting the educational system to the needs of the areas. As that might seem a little illogical having regard to the action he now proposed to take, he explained that he should vote for the Amendment because of what took place on the previous evening. On the previous evening the Opposition had pressed upon the Government a very moderate measure of justice, namely, the right of the owners of schools to appeal to the Board of Education in any case where the local authority had declined for one reason or another to transfer the school. The President of the Board of Education had rejected that proposal. He therefore asked if schools capable of giving good and desirable education were to be ruled out by the mere *obiter dictum* of the local education authority. It had been said they were ungrateful for the concessions which the Government had been good enough from time to time to make. He believed that what was called a concession had been made on the subject of the appeal. But every concession made by the Government had been accompanied by the taking away of something else which had been previously allowed in the Bill, and, on the whole, what was taken away was in larger measure than the concession granted. The hon. Member for Droitwich had asked why they were prepared to vote for what they said was a retrograde proposal. The principle of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Preston, he pointed out, had been admitted by the Government itself in Clause 4. The hon. Member had also said that if he thought the Bill was harsh in its incidence to the Church he would not support it. Surely the hon Gentleman had forgotten that in the opinion of the President of the Board of Education it was harsh; that the right hon. Gentleman had said that sometimes minorities must suffer. They must take what they could get. The schools upon which this Amendment would operate were of two kinds. One kind consisted of those schools which asked to be taken over and which the local authority refused to take over; the other of those schools the owners of which declined to accept the terms offered by the local authority. The latter might possibly have funds, or if they had not they would have owners and trustees capable of supporting and maintaining them in a condition fully qualified to take part in the education of the country. Of these two classes the rejected schools were less likely to have, although they might have, friends willing to undertake sacrifices for their continuation. The whole difficulty had arisen because the Government had thrown on the local authority the decision of a question which ought rather to be settled by the House itself, namely, the question of an appeal to the Board of Education. They were afraid to ask Parliament to adjudicate upon the question; the Board of Education was afraid of having the burden thrown upon them, and the result was that it was thrown on the local authority. They now had to choose between religious freedom and educational efficiency, and he declared for religious freedom. What would happen would be this: the Government would have done something to mar the educational advantages acquired under the Act of 1902. They would have done something to injure the progress of education in the country, and would be as far as, if not farther than, ever from the solution of those religious difficulties with which they professed to deal when this Bill was introduced in this House.

MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) said that some of them who were not entirely opposed to contracting-out under great emergencies would vote with an absolutely clear conscience against the Amendment of his hon. friend on this occasion. That which might be a positive tonic and necessity in a small degree and on rare occasions, might become something like an educational poison if it were used in all parts of the country. Even if it were supported by various parts of the House in the spirit of anything like a final settlement, behind the speeches of the hon. baronet who had just sat down and the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool there was very imperfectly concealed the desire to use this merely as a platform from which to get further financial support without local control and apart from the national system. He thought they were justified in voting in regard to this Amendment, not so much perhaps upon its ostensible meaning as upon the character of the forces which were supporting it and the aims they so imperfectly hid. Therefore, from the point of view of one who could well imagine arguments in favour of contracting-out under very rigid conditions and where there was a *bona fide* desire to pay—and to pay considerably for the privilege of appointing the teacher, which was inconsistent with the national system, he would most heartily vote against the Amendment, because it was intended, not perhaps by his hon. friend, but by some of its supporters, to attack this Bill in its very heart and destroy it. Those who had supported the Bill in all its main lines and believed in its general fabric he was sure would vote against the Amendment, however willing they might be to admit the principle in extreme cases, and however ready they were, as he was, to support Clause 4 as it stood, believing that the State-aided school was desirable in some cases. But the State-aided school in all parts of the country, under the conditions his hon. friend suggested, backed by the support of those who had taken a large part in this debate, would be against education and an important constitutional principle.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) did not think the statement of the hon. Member for the Droitwich Division ought to pass without some notice on the Opposition side of the House. The hon. Gentleman had made a statement with some amount of assurance that the asperities of this Bill were to be toned down by the Government either here or in another place. If the Minister for Education had told them that sooner he would have eased the passage of the Bill. But what he wanted to call attention to was the educational damage that would be done under this Bill. He wanted to put aside the religious injustice that would be done. The hon. Member for Preston proposed to go back to a state of affairs before 1902. If the hon. Member knew the conditions of the voluntary schools before that time and the difficulties under which they were worked he would not propose to go back to that state of things. Everyone knew that many of the voluntary schools were unsatisfactory, but no one supposed that they were unsatisfactory because the managers preferred to have them ill-staffed, badly lighted, and poorly equipped. It was want of money alone that prevented them from being on the same level as the board schools. The hon. Member for Preston wanted to send them back into a condition in which they would be, to use the Prime Minister's words, "on the verge of hunger." The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool said that the damage done by the contracting-out clause should be rectified by more money being given by the Government to these schools, and that they should receive as much money from the Treasury as they would have received in rates and taxes. From the religious point of view he admitted that was fair, but it would break up the whole system which they were at present building up, namely, the control of education through the local education authorities. For that reason he should be opposed to it, because he believed that the local authorities were quite as likely to be just towards the religious bodies of this country as the central body; in fact, he believed they were more ready to do justice to the different religious communions than this House of Commons. The whole difficulty rested upon their refusal to remove the fetter which bound the local authorities, and prevented their giving the sort of education required by the children in these schools. If the Government had consented to remove that fetter it would have been possible for the local authorities to give to those schools such religious instruction as they required, and without inflicting any damage to the cause of education or breaking up the system of national control as this clause did. Because he believed the Amendment of the hon. Member did not really bring about any settlement of the religious question, but would inflict a most irreparable blow to the cause of education, he was totally unable to support it.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 318. (Division List No. 253.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, R.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Havland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Glover, Thomas
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J,
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy, Lanrence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazelton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir JohnH.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Muntz, Sir Philip
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid

O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J
Partington, Oswald
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farqhuarson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim S.)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E. R.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Harold Cox and Mr. Hart-Davies.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HebrertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire, N. E.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, SirT.Glen (Renfrew, W)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C.H(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardie, J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset, N
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.

King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley. Rt. Hon. John
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Palmer, Sir Charles Mark
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickets, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw. Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh).
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, SirJohnL.(Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wison, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) said that as hon. Members opposite complained that they had not been allowed sufficient time for discussion he would not move the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper.

LORD R. CECIL moved to insert after the word "if" the words "required by the owners or trustees." He thought that instead of rejecting a school the local authority should be permitted to take it over, leaving the Commission to determine whether facilities should be granted. As Clauses 2 and 3 stood at present the whole question whether facilities should be granted was left entirely open. No indication was contained in the Bill that the local education authority ought to assent to the demand of the schools. The Government held the view that the question of granting or withholding facilities ought not to be an element in the local authorities' minds in making their arrangements for taking the schools over. If the House accepted this Amendment that intention would be carried out, and the local authority would see that the legislature had laid down that facilities should be granted if required, and if they did not grant them they would be departing from the plain sense and intention of the Act. If the clause remained as it now stood it would be left entirely as a matter of free bargaining between the local authority and the owners, and there was nothing to prevent the local authority taking up the position which the Government did not desire them to take up, namely, that of refusing to take over a school because facilities were demanded. Ordinary administrative bodies generally desired to carry out the intention of the legislature, and it was important that the wording of the clauses should clearly express the intention of Parliament. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would agree to insert the words "required by the owners or trustees." Those words would effect a change which he thought would convert this clause into something real and tangible.

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) formally seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 33, after the word 'if' to insert the words 'required by the owners or trustees.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. BIRRELL said it would be acting contrary to the intention of the Bill to lay down that facilities should be compulsory under this clause. He could not believe that local authorities would be animated by any such motives as those which had been attributed to them in order to avoid granting such very moderate facilities as were made legal under this clause. If a local authority were so minded, nothing short of absolute compulsion, which the Committee and the House had already rejected, would secure the object which the noble Lord had in view, because the local authority would find it by no means difficult to avoid taking over the school either because it was unwilling to pay the rent demanded or because it did not choose to enter into any negotiations. He was bound to say that he did not see how the words proposed made the clause any plainer; in fact, he thought they made it rather more obscure. The section ran—

"If the affording of facilities under this section for the giving of religious instruction of some special character not permitted under Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, has been made a condition of any arrangement for the use by the local education authority of the schoolhouse of a transferred voluntary school, or of any scheme under this part of this Act with respect thereto, or of the purchase or hire of the schoolhouse, that authority shall, notwithstanding anything in that section, afford those facilities by enabling children whose parents wish them to receive religious instruction of that special character to receive that instruction on not more than two mornings a week."

He admitted that the gap was there, but once an authority dealt with a school, and came to any terms with regard to it, this obligation, if the trustees demanded facilities, was as firm as language could make it. He agreed with the noble Lord that the language of a clause was sometimes very useful as indicating the intention of the Legislature, but he really thought the language of this clause was as plain and peremptory as it could be, short of entirely bridging the gap in the way the noble Lord desired.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman in the distinction he had drawn between the Amendment and the words of the clause. He thought there was a valuable addition in the terms suggested by the noble Lord. The clause as it stood rather implied that the affording of facilities might be made a condition of the agreement, and that, therefore, it was a debatable matter between the parties when they were coming to an arrangement. That was just the thing they wished to avoid. If the words of the noble Lord's Amendment were accepted, there could be no debate or disagreement on that matter at all. The right hon. Gentleman evidently fully accepted the idea that the matter should be absolutely peremptory, and if that was so, something was required to make the clause clear.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) thought there was all the difference in the world between the words of the Amendment and those of the clause. The assumption of Clause 3 was, "If this school is transferred under an arrangement with the local authority or under a scheme made by the Commission." Take two cases. First, suppose the local authority did not wish to take over the school. In that case there was no obligation on them to do so, there was no appeal to the Board of Education or to the Commission, and all hope of facilities at once disappeared. The second case was this, and it was here that the words of the Amendment would operate: Let it be assumed that the local authority wished to take over the school. The owners then bargained for facilities being granted; the local authority refused; the negotiations broke down. The local authority resolved to go before the Commission. The Commission might make facilities a condition of the scheme, and, if so, this was binding on the local authority. But the Commission might decline; and so long as that gap remained they maintained that it was not unreasonable to urge that, if schools which had been built to give a special kind of religious education were to be transferred at all, the transfer should carry with it the right to give the instruction for which the schools were established. The noble Lord's Amendment would give effect to that. He thought there was a misunderstanding as to the meaning of the words, "has been made a condition of the arrangement." He understood those words to mean "has been embodied in the agreement as binding on both parties." He fancied hon. Members opposite construed those words in an entirely different sense, as meaning, if one side said "We stipulate for facilities," they were entitled to have them, and it should be one of the terms of the transfer. It would be obvious to those who had followed the somewhat complicated conditions of this clause that the noble Lord's Amendment was a perfectly fitting way to give effect to the intention of the clause, which, as it stood, entirely fell short of what was required.

MR. BIRRELL said the speech of the hon. Member for Cambridge University did not deal with the point of the noble Lord's Amendment. The difficulty he had was in seeing what effect the words proposed by the noble Lord would have. In what way would they make the clause better than it was at present?

MR. BUTCHER said there was a difference between saying that, if the affording of facilities was made a condition, a certain result should follow—that was according to the Bill as it stood—and saying that, if required by the owners, the affording of facilities should be made a condition of the transfer.

MR. BIRRELL said the view the Government took was that the owners and trustees were the persons who were in the position to make it the condition of any arrangement, so far as they were concerned, that the facilities must be granted. Then, if the local authority took them before the Commissioners, he could not conceive how it would be possible for the Commissioners to disregard the claim for facilities. He still thought the clause was as clear as it could be made, and that the words proposed by the noble Lord would have no effect whatever in bridging over the gap.

*MR. BUTCHER hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the words of this clause, for he was sure from the course of this discussion that it would be easy to come to an agreement upon this point at issue.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the right hon. Gentleman did not apprehend the force of the right hon. Gentleman's objection. What they wanted to secure was that if the owners or trustees required facilities, the facilities should be made a part of the arrangement. There was nothing in the clause to provide for that. The clause only provided that if facilities were part of this arrangement they should be given. He believed that his hon. friend only wanted the Government to put in the clause words which would set out that the terms of the agreement should be carried out.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) asked the Minister for Education to consider this point, that from end to end of the Bill there was no indication that it was the desire of the Government that the local education authority should give facilities. He could conceive no better form of words to indicate that than those in the Amendment. Unless the Amendment was accepted there was nothing in the Bill to direct a right minded man as to what his duties were under it. A man might have every desire to fulfil the law, but he might have also conscientious scruples against denominational education, and so far as the Bill was concerned he was under no sort of duty either legally or morally to grant facilities for religious education. His contention was that either the clause should give a real direction to the local education authority to grant the facilities for religious instruction to which, it was admitted, the owners of the school were entitled as a condition of the arrangement, or, on the other hand, it should give to the owners the right of taking the local education authority, should it refuse to give the facilities, before the Commissioners.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said he would recall one phrase used by the Minister for Education in addressing the House. That right hon. Gentleman had said that if the trustees or managers failed to do their duty to get facilities, and if the local education authority came to no terms with them, and brought them before the Commissioners, then the Commissioners could not do otherwise than order that the facilities should be given. Consequently, the Minister for Education anticipated that the reasonable and normal case would be the granting of facilities by the local education authority. That being so, what they on the Opposition side of the House asked in the name of reason and right was the insertion of words to secure that what the Minister for Education said would happen should happen. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment of his noble friend.

MR. BIRRELL said that the more this matter was discussed the more it seemed to him that the object of hon. Gentlemen opposite was to put some kind of compulsion or pressure on the local education authority to take over the school. That was completely vetoed by the Bill. They were not interfering with the power of the local education authority to refuse to take over the school if they so wished, and he was convinced that the language of the Amendment would only obscure the issue. He could not possibly accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 93; Noes 359. (Division List, No. 254.)

AYES.

Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn. A.J.(CityLond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H.M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Geoffrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS. Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.SirJohn H.
King, SirHenry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)

Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowel Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Kean, John
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, JohnThrogmort'n
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingtn
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Col. Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E.(Liverpool,Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond. Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephA.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott(Somerst
Balrow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barranl Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, SirJohnT.(Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, SirT.Glen(Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St.PancrasN
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford,S.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glover,Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardie,J.Heir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy.H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)

Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (RoscommonN
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, S.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E.(Edinburgh,Central
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russel (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick T. T. L.
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edward(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) moved to leave out from the passage "if the affording of facilities under this section for the giving of religious instruction of some special character," etc., in Clause, 3 the words "under this section." He said that the words which he proposed to omit seemed as they stood somewhat incomprehensible. Either they were more or less meaningless and therefore ought to be omitted or they ought to be defined. It seemed to be the right hon. Gentleman's intention that Clause 4 should stand in contradistinction to Clause 3. Clause 4 made it clear what was the meaning of extended facilities, but Clause 3 said nothing about what the ordinary facilities were. He thought they were entitled, if these words were to be retained, to a clear definition from the right hon. Gentleman of what he meant by facilities "under this section." The words as they stood were somewhat peculiar and ambiguous. If the right hon. Gentleman was unable to define what the facilities were he thought that the only possible course was to omit these words.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 33, to leave out the words 'under this section.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL could not understand how the hon. Gentleman had read these words in the manner in which he had done. He said they were meaningless, but then went on to argue that they were not so. The words meant the ordinary facilities described in the section itself which were to be afforded to children whose parents wished them to receive religious instruction of a special character, and it was provided that they should receive that instruction on not more than two mornings a week. He had already explained that they did not want to put in words to the effect that the religious instruction should be that contemplated by the trusts, for the reason that they did not want to have the particular provisions of the trust made into rules, so that for all time they would have to go back to the trust deeds, because sometimes there were no trust deeds at all. He did not think it was an inconvenient thing to limit the expression and to keep the two things, ordinary facilities and extended facilities, distinct in the mind. The answer to the hon. Member was that the special instruction demanded or bargained for by the owners or the trustees was the sort that before went on in the school.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the right hon. Gentleman would see after the explanation he had made that there was a certain incongruity between the plan suggested by Clause 3 and the plan embodied in Clause 8. What the right hon. Gentleman contemplated was that there should be no reference to the trust deeds in any free bargain between the trustees and the local authority. The trustees might ask for anything they pleased and the right hon. Gentleman trusted them on the whole not to ask for too much. That was in the case of the "use and wont" schools. He expected them to ask only for what was justified by the meaning of "use and wont." If there was a trust deed, he expected them to ask for only such facilities as would allow them to carry out the terms of the trust. But if there was no agreement made under Clause 3, then Clause 8 contemplated that the trustees should be taken before the Commissioners, who had to go back to the trust deed. The Commissioners were expected, if there was a trust deed, to interpret it as if they were the Court of Chancery, in which case the interpretation must be a rigid and a narrow one, and if there was no trust deed then regard was to be had to "use and wont." A new set of considerations came into existence in the event of no agreement being come to between the owners and the local authority. He did not think it was a very logical proceeding. So long as the bargain was a free one the trustees might be trusted to do anything they wished to do, but directly there was a controversy about the views, wishes, and prejudices of the local authority, and not about anything connected with the way in which the school was carried on, the alien subject of the trust deed was brought in as a guiding principle in the arrangement. It was not a very coherent plan. He had no desire to press the matter beyond this point, because he was not sure that the right hon. Gentleman differed from him. He hoped if the right hon. Gentleman agreed with him that he would admit that this was one of those inevitable errors that crept into Bills of this kind. If the right hon. Gentleman said he (Mr. Balfour) was wrong perhaps he or some other member of the Government would kindly say how they reconciled the professions of Clause 3 with Clause 8.

MR. BIRRELL said that he did not suppose this Bill would work for ever or would be a final solution to the education problem of this country. It was not at all an uncommon thing that in a free bargain the parties should come to their own terms. When they could not come to terms they went to a court of law which very often resulted in terms which they certainly never contemplated. If the owners could not come to terms with the local authority they had to appear before the Commissioners, who were to inquire into the trust deeds of the school. This was very much the same question as when the owners or trustees came to the local authority and said—

> "This is a Wesleyan school which has been carried on for the last fifty years as such; if you take it over we want the facilities to go on in the same way as before; our trust deed permits it."

The local authority would concede these terms, and he did not believe that the facilities under this clause would create any difficulties among the local authorities throughout the country. They were so moderate, so reasonable, that he could hardly conceive any local authority making a difficulty about the subject, and the question they would settle between themselves as free agents would be practically the same question as would come up before the Commissioners.

LORD R. CECIL said the right hon. Gentleman appeared to have lost sight of the important question which underlay this Amendment, namely, what was meant by "facilities" under this section. They were required by the clause to give facilities for religious instruction. That could only be given in one of three ways: either they must pay for the facilities, allow their servant, the teacher, to give them, or give them in school hours. He could imagine no other method by which this special education could be given. By another section they were expressly forbidden to pay for facilities, they were were expressly forbidden to allow their teachers to give this teaching or to allow it to be given in school hours. He compared Clauses 2 and 6, and commented on the doubt as to whether denominational instruction was a part of carrying on a public elementary school. What was the local authority expected to do when it was asked to provide facilities?

MR. BIRRELL said that the facilities were to be the special facilities bargained for by the owners of the trust school and in accordance with the provisions of the trust deed. They would be given as part of the curriculum of the school as heretofore, but not paid for by the rates.

*MR. TALBOT: Would the religious instruction be given in school hours?

MR. BIRRELL said it would. It might be given perhaps from 9 o'clock to half past.

*MR. TALBOT said nobody was obliged to come to it.

MR. BIRRELL said that was so, because it was only given to those children whose parents desired it.

MR. EVELYN CECIL said that after the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman he would with permission of the House withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CAVE moved to leave out the words "not more than" from page 3, line 2. The effect of that would be that this special religious instruction would be given on two days a week. Personally, he would have preferred the words to be "nor less than two mornings," but he would be satisfied with a fixed number of days. It was pretty clear that the Minister for Education intended that two mornings a week should be fixed as was shown by the next Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. Gentleman.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.

"In page 3, line 2, to leave out the words 'not more than.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIRRELL said he had always contemplated that in the great majority of cases the full two days would be demanded. But there were many schools, he had been given to understand, where the special religious instruction had been confined to one day a week, and he did not think it was desirable that the local authority should be under any obligation to impose upon the owners a zeal for special religious instruction which they did not feel. Therefore he thought the words "not more than two days" was a fair indication that the owners could have two days by asking for them, and if they did not it was because they thought one day was enough. Though he agreed that the Amendment standing in his name took the maximum and assumed the maximum would be asked, he did not see why he should impose upon the local authority the obligation of giving special religious instruction on two days if the owners and trustees were content with one day.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said this particular form of instruction had to be provided by the owners and trustees, and if they thought fit he did not see why it should be limited to two days a week. There was no logical ground for the distinction made between places with a population of less than 5,000 and those with more, and when the right hon. Gentleman introduced the quite new element in the controversy that this matter was going to be controlled by the local education authority, he thought he was going to take away one of the few valuable parts of Clause 3. If the local education authority decided as to Cowper-Temple teaching and also had complete authority and control over religious instruction of a denominational character, it would be adding injustice to a hardship already existing, and would reduce the value of this clause to a very little indeed. Was the local education authority, in point of fact, to control this teaching?

MR. LAURENCE HARDY thought they were entitled to an answer to the question of the noble Lord. They had some ground of complaint that suddenly at this late period of the Bill the two mornings for special religious instruction were, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, to be whittled away to one in some instances. A very low limit was put in the Bill and had been defended in the fullest sense by the right hon. Gentleman in more than one speech. If, as he thought, there was some doubt in words like "not more than two," and when they had it confirmed by the right hon. Gentleman, he thought they were fully justified in asking that words should be removed from the Bill which in any way took away one very small privilege which the owner of denominational schools were given. Many Members had doubted whether it was necessary to move the Amendment, but after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman it was undoubtedly rightly moved.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.) said it seemed to him the matter was extremely simple as it stood in the Bill. The local education authority would not control this special religious instruction, its business would be simply to give facilities for it on not more than two mornings, and if the trustees or owners only wished to give religious instruction on one morning it would be no part of the local education authority's duty to give it on two mornings.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the hon. Gentleman entirely forgot that there was another possible case, namely that of the trustees desiring to have two days and the local authority taking advantage of some weakness in the position of the trustees to say that they should not have more than one. That was the justification for this Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 272; Noes, 114. (Division List No. 255.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex,Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton,Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehman, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George. Rt, Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarbor'o
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)

Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edward(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John (Allsebrook)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. Glamorgan
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn. MichaelHugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Havliand
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, SirHenrySeymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, JohnThrogmort'n
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.,
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavel
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Cave.

MR. LOUGH moved to add at the end of sub-section (1) of Clause 3 the words "and the mornings fixed by the local education authority shall be the same mornings in the week for all those children, unless the authority, on account of the accommodation in the school, or the number of classes in the school, consider that the instruction cannot be efficiently given on the same mornings to all the children whose parents wish them to receive it." He said that this Amendment was moved in fulfilment of a promise to the Leader of the Opposition that it would be made quite clear that if the whole of the children could not receive special religious instruction on two mornings facilities might be given for imparting it on more than two mornings. It would be for the local authorities to determine whether such further facilities were necessary.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 3, at end, to insert the words 'and the mornings fixed by the local education authority shall be the same mornings in the week for all those children, unless the authority on account of the accommodation in the school, or the number of classes in the school, consider that the instruction cannot be efficiently given on the same mornings to all the children whose parents wish them to receive it.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

LORD BALCARRES said he did not think this clause fulfilled the pledge asked for by the Leader of the Opposition. Six or seven weeks ago, when discussing Clause 3, at the end of an evening's debate, it was announced by the President of the Board of Education that the children in any of the transferred schools, so long as they did not obtain the religious instruction on more than two days in the week might receive that instruction on any two days. The Leader of the Opposition on that occasion asked for no concession and required no pledge; he did not even ask for the clause to be amended; he was quite ready to accept the obvious interpretation put upon it by the Minister in charge of the Bill. Just before the fall of the guillotine on that occasion grave dissatisfaction was expressed on the Ministerial side of the House at the interpretation given by the President of the Board of Education, because the intention of the supporters of the Government was that two days should be fixed during the week upon which this instruction should be given, and that the remaining three days should be devoted to Cowper-Temple teaching. That was specifically stated by a representative of the Government sitting on the front Bench. He thought the Amendment as it stood was open to grave objection, and it was faultily drafted. If also seemed to him to be based upon a very peculiar reading of the clause. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had told them that a local education authority would not control denominational education, but if the words now proposed in the Amendment did not give the local authority full control then he did not know what control meant. As a matter of fact, they were giving the local authority extensive control in regard to this question, for it would have to settle the cardinal principles upon which the instruction would have to be given. He did not understand upon what grounds of expediency or principle it was necessary that the local authority should have any control whatever in regard to this instruction. The provision applied to a population of less than 5,000, but such country districts in the near future might become town districts. Reference had often been made in these debates to a parish in Somersetshire which had 15,000 inhabitants. That parish, not being an urban area within the definition given in this Bill, it must have Clause 3 instead of Clause 4 facilities. But if that parish desired to be incorporated as an urban district, it could immediately transfer itself from Clause 3 to Clause 4, and the local education authority would have to exercise control over religious instruction for which it had no responsibility. He thought the Amendment was open to many grave objections. He objected to it on principle. It in no way carried out the pledge which had been given.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said he preferred the clause as it stood, and, as the noble Lord opposite and his friends rejected what he could not but think was a concession on the part of the President of the Board of Education, he suggested that his right hon. friend should withdraw the Amendment, and so leave the difference of opinion as to the interpretation to be placed on the clause exactly where it was. He thought it would be interpreted as meaning that religious instruction was not to be given on more than two mornings of the week. If the opponents of the right hon. Gentleman's concession were so confident in their own reading of the section that they were willing to accept it without the Amendment' he was not less confident of his interpretation and he was equally willing to have the section without the Amendment which had given rise to this discussion. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should withdraw his Amendment.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said he did not in the least desire this so-called concession. He preferred the words as they stood originally. He had understood the right hon. Gentleman opposite to interpret the words as meaning that there were to be facilities for religious instruction on two mornings a week for every child, no matter whether it might be necessary for that purpose that such facilities should be extended over the whole of the five mornings a week. He and his friends looked upon all this as a miserable arrangement.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said he was rather in favour of the Amendment. As he read it, what it meant was that, if it was found that, by reason of the number of children in the school, they could not get proper religious instruction on two days in the week, the local authority could allow those responsible for the school to spread the religious instruction over five mornings. That struck him as a very good and fair arrangement.

MR. BIRRELL said he did not propose to listen to the blandishments of either side. He proposed to adhere to his own stern course. He always construed the clause to mean that the children in a school were not to receive this special religious instruction on more than two days a week. He never contemplated the true construction of the clause to be that they were all of them to receive that religious education on the same two days. He agreed with the noble Lord that this Amendment was not a concession to the other side. It was an Amendment which he regarded as necessary in consequence of the difference of opinion which existed on both sides of the House as to the true construction of the clause. In the face of the opposition from both sides of the House he thought the Amendment a reasonable and proper one. It secured what was the intention of the clause.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that what they on the Opposition side understood was that no child could receive religious instruction on more than two days a week, but that for the convenience of those attending a school such instruction could be given on five mornings a week. That was also the view of the right hon. Gentleman, and he believed it was a perfectly correct view. It was the right hon. Gentleman's own supporters who wished to have a limitation of the facilities to two mornings a week, and it was for that reason that the right hon. Gentleman introduced this proposal to make the clause perfectly clear. There was no doubt that somebody must decide how often the denominational teaching should be given, but he could not believe that it should be left to the local education authority, which they had been told by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had no control whatever over religious teaching. Who was to decide whether the religious education was sufficient or the teachers were efficient? In the rural areas the managers of the schools would be under great disabilities. There was no provision in the Bill for the representatives of the denomination on the management or on the local authority. Under the Act of 1902 the management very fairly represented the religious opinion of the denomination, but under the Bill as it now stood the managers would consist of four representatives chosen by the local education authority, and two by the minor local authority. Probably they would not be able to say anything about the efficiency of the religious instruction. The Minister for Education had talked about the denomination running riot over the schools, but considering that the facilities for religious instruction were to be given only between nine and half-past nine in the morning of two days in the week, that the expense of the instruction was to be borne by the denomination, and that the instruction was not to be given by the school teachers, but by others, how could i be said that the denomination would run riot over the schools? Surely, somebody representing the denomination or the teachers should be allowed to settle whether the teaching could be conveniently given on two mornings a week to all the children. The local authority ought not to be invited to come in and decide as to the length of time during which the religious teaching was to be given.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he welcomed the Amendment, if only because it definitely laid down that the matter was to be determined by the local authority. He thought the President of the Board of Education had carried out his promise with perfect fairness.

*Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) moved as an Amendment to the proposed Amendment to add after the word "school" on line 4, the words "or the teachers available." The reason for this Amendment was to make it perfectly clear that some consideration should be given to the number of religious teachers available for giving the denominational instruction. If the ordinary teachers of the schools were not to be available for giving religious instruction, the field for drawing religious teachers from would be comparatively small. The danger of the Amendment as it stood was that the local authority might say that they had only to consider the accommodation in the school, and the number of classes; that there were so many children, and that two teachers would be quite enough to give them the religious instruction. But if there were a large number of children and only one teacher available it might be necessary for that teacher to come in on more than two mornings a week.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) seconded the Amendment. He was quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman meant to carry out his undertaking effectually, but it was perfectly obvious that in certain districts there would be great difficulty in finding the requisite number of teachers. Therefore that was a consideration which ought to enter into the minds of the local authority.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'or the teachers available.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Mr. BIRRELL said he appreciated the point of the Amendment to his Amendment, and would meet it if he could. But he feared that if the pressure which the clause put on the denominations tc secure sufficient teachers for giving the religious instruction on two days of the week were removed, the religious instruction would extend over three or four days of the week, which was undesirable save where it was absolutely necessary. He therefore could not accept the Amendment.

*Viscount MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider this matter a little more. He had said that there had been a little misunderstanding about the clause, but if there was any misunderstanding in the House it was quite clear that there would be more misunderstanding in the country. The clause bound the local authority to give this teaching on two days a week, supposing that certain conditions were fulfilled. Those conditions had reference to the accommodation of the schools and the number of classes, and he thought they should, in accordance with the Amendment of his hon. friend, insert a provision that regard should be had to the number of teachers available. The schoolmaster, unfortunately, was to be debarred from giving the religious instruction, and his experience of the country was that if the schoolmaster did not give the teaching the only available peison was the clergyman. The pressure put by the clause, according to the President of the Board of Education, could not be effective, as pressure could not produce persons to give the teaching who were not in existence. As, therefore, only one teacher was available, it was obvious that the religious instruction must be spread over the week.

LORD BALCARRES thought the reply of the right hon. Gentleman, though not favourable, was far from being hostile. Perhaps in Parliamentary phrase the Minister for Education would take into consideration the desirability of inserting these words under which regard would have to be had to the number of teachers available. The accommodation and the number of classes had to be taken into account, and why should not the number of teachers available be also considered? He did not understand the right hon. Gentleman's statement that if the pressure which the clause put on to denominations to secure sufficient teachers for giving the religious instruction on two days a week were removed that instruction might extend over three or four days. He did not see how the right hon. Gentleman applied it and it appeared to him to be rather a *non sequiter*. He thought that this teacher question was one upon which the owners of schools and the teachers could not consider that they had been justly treated. Clause 3 schools were called country schools, but it did not follow that they would not exist in the middle of London or Manchester, although no doubt the difficulty would be to know how to manage in the country districts. In many country districts in this country if they excluded the professional teacher from giving religious instruction it would be extremely difficult to find competent persons capable of instructing two, three, or four classes of children. It was upon country districts therefore where the teacher was *ex hypothesi* less easily obtainable that they were placing this difficulty. He did not, however, think it was any good pressing the matter, which he hoped would be considered at a later stage.

*MR. R. PEARCE (Staffordshire, Leek) hoped that the Minister for Education would not be led away in this little matter charm the Opposition never so wisely. He was acquainted with country districts and he did not think that there would be any difficulty in getting plenty of teachers. If the clergyman was not available there was his wife, daughter, or curate, and failing them he had no doubt that the neighbouring Wesleyan or other Nonconformist ministers would gladly take part in this particular instruction at the beginning of the school day if they were offered a share of the little rent that was going. In the anatomy of the general body of education, when they were discussing facilities and extended facilities it reminded him of the appendix and that little tail bone at the end of the spinal column said to be superfluous parts of the human body, which some persons wished should be excised altogether, but which must be of some use. He was glad the Minister for Education proposed to retain these little parts while he was so building up the whole body of education in this country that the head of it might be thoroughly well developed and the heart of it brought into harmony with the wishes of those who desired to combine, if they could, some measure of religious instruction with the secular education of the children.

LORD R. CECIL wished the speech which had just been delivered had been delivered in a fuller House, because the argument of the hon. Member was worthy of the attitude which had been taken up in regard to this Amendment. The hon. Member had likened religious instruction to those injurious parts of the human frame which were best dealt with by excisions, and had also said that if the clergyman could not give religious instruction it might be dealt with by the Nonconformist minister, who would be paid a salary. What was the objection of the right hon. Gentleman to this particular Amendment? It was the fact that there might be difficulty on the part of the local education authority in finding out what teachers were available. That was the one argument to which the right hon. Gentleman attached importance. He did not quite understand why the right hon. Gentleman took that view. The allocation of these two days had now been thrown on the local education authority, whilst before the Amendment was proposed they understood it was to be left to the owners to settle the two days upon which religious instruction was to be given. How could the local authority settle which of the two days would be most convenient for the teaching of the denominational religion? The only way they could do so was by a local inquiry. It could not be done without. The local conditions must be ascertained. The local authority would have to have some manager or someone with whom they could correspond for the purpose of ascertaining the every-day detail of the working of the school. If they had someone with whom to correspond, it was perfectly easy to ask: "What are the teachers available in your judgment for giving this denominational instruction?" That was all the Amendment said, and surely it was a reasonable thing. He saw no more difficulty in the way of the local education authority's obtaining information on this point than of obtaining their information on any other. It was not a question of paying for a good teacher. If it were only the cost of a good teacher, the difficulty would never arise. The case they were dealing with was one when the conditions might be and very often were that the clergyman was the only educated man in the parish. That was not at all an uncommon state of things in the rural parishes of England. It was far more common than hon. Members believed, and he could give some very pathetic instances to the House. Such a condition of things could not be met by any amount of payment. It was not a question of the managers being reluctant to obtain the best men possible; they would be only too desirous of getting the best man. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell to an extent that the admission of outsiders into a school interfered with the discipline, and on that ground he thought it was desirable that the teachers should give this education, but the House had decided against him on that, and there was nothing more to be said. He thought every argument was in favour of the Amendment of his hon. friend, and that on the educational and religious arguments, as well as from the point of view of general convenience, the Amendment ought to be accepted.

Mr. BIRRELL could not bring himself to think that the Amendment was really necessary. He did not like to put in such words as "the number of teachers available," because that would depend a little on the pains taken to procure them, and if there was no temptation to secure teachers very little trouble would be taken about it. People would say, "We have a very good teacher, and that is enough." They ought to have a clause which did put some pressure on the denominations to procure a teacher. It seemed to him very lamentable that there should be such destitution of teaching power in subjects connected with religion, such destitution that they rarely found anybody to come in.

Viscount MORPETH said there were many people capable of giving such teaching who were engaged in earning their daily bread, and therefore were not available in the middle of the morning to come and teach religion in the schools.

Mr. BIRRELL said it was a lamentable state of things that there was such destitution. To give an intelligent lesson to very young children was very difficult. They could not limit the number of teachers available for these classes, because the one thing that the managers had to satisfy themselves about was the efficiency of the teachers. The insertion of such words would be dangerous, as suggesting to the denomination that they did not need to take any pains to secure teachers. Therefore, though he did not wish to limit the number of teachers available, he did not think he ought to make that a condition.

*Mr. BUTCHER said that he admitted that it was not reasonable to object to the local authorities having some real control over the schools which they required for carrying on the education of the country. The right hon. Gentleman, however, seemed to have lost sight of the fact that in leaving it to the local authorities to settle the days and hours when this instruction was to be given he handed over to them incidentally much larger powers of control; he allowed them to say not only when, but how the teaching should be given, though they did not employ the teachers or pay their salaries. It seemed to him that the number of teachers was one of the most material points to be taken into consideration. A hostile local authority might bring strong pressure upon the owners to have a larger staff, in order to compress the religious teaching of a special character into two mornings of the week; and yet, as everybody knew, it would be as much as ever they could hope for if they got two competent teachers in any village of rural England. He did not therefore, think that the right hon. Gentleman would go at all beyond his own intentions in this clause if he put in these limiting words, thereby suggesting that the paucity of teachers in some districts would be a sufficient justification for holding religious instruction on more than two days of the week.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 108; Noes, 245. (Division List No. 256.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn.MichaelHugh Hicks
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, SirHenrySeymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William Clare()
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Bridgeman and Mr. Lane-Fox.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn. W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)

Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C.H(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, G. Croydon(Launcest'n
Marnham, F. J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. (Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton underLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chrles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Snowdon, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.
Steadman, W. C,
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whitley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. RAWLINSON moved as an Amendment to the proposed Amendment to insert after "classes," the words "or children." It was almost a verbal Amendment. All that they were getting in the way of concession was that the teaching of this religious instruction was to be given out of school hours at the expense of the people who wanted to give it, leaving it to the local education authority to determine on which days it should be given. All that was asked in this Amendment was that the local education authority with absolute discretion might take into consideration not only the accommodation of the school and the number of classes, but the number of children who had to be taught.

MR. CAVE seconded.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 4, after the word 'classes,' to insert the words 'or children.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. LOUGH said he was sorry it would be impossible to accept this Amendment. They could not extend the points of conflict in discussing these matters between the local authorities and the trustees of the school. He thought the object the hon. Gentleman had in view was sufficiently secured by the word "accommodation" in the Government's Amendment.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN considered the reply which had been given was not satisfactory, as accommodation had nothing to do with the number of children in attendance. He hoped some better reply to the Amendment would be given.

*MR. LEIF JONES pointed out that the number of classes was largely determined by the number of children. He thought the Amendment superfluous.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was not merely the number of children that determined the number of the classes, but also the age of the children. He thought his hon. friend who had moved this Amendment would have been better advised if he had said the number and ages of the children. It was quite clear that the whole subject was not exhausted by accommodation and classes. Perhaps the word that was superfluous was classes, because accommodation did imply the number of class-rooms. At any rate the Amendment to the Amendment was an improvement, and he was utterly unable to see what objection there could be to it. The managers had no voice in this matter at all, and there was no appeal. It rested absolutely with the local authority to decide. The Government believed that the local authority were capable of dealing with the matter, and they had handed it over to them absolutely to determine. Surely there could be no objection to making the small concession that was asked for by this Amendment.

MR. LANE-FOX said he did not quite understand the meaning of these words. It was quite possible that there might be more than one class of more than one denomination. [Cries of "No."] He thought it would be possible for different denominations to have classes. The number of children in each class was a very material point.

Question put, and negatived.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR desired to place on record the very important fact that the Government, by introducing this Amendment, had expressed, not for the first time, their view that it was the business of the local authority to deal, not merely with undenominational religion, but with questions affecting the denominations. That was an important admission, and it might conceivably at some subsequent period be of great value.

Main Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes 318; Noes 54. (Division List No. 257.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grove, Archibald
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healey, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geodrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland, Barratt- Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral,)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John

Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N.(Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C E (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon.T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Frankln
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H De. R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax.)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn.SirAlexF
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,) E.
Clough, W.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim)
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Rawlinson and Sir Frederick Banbury.

Lord BALCARRES moved to leave out the word "giving" in order to ask on what principle the apportionment of the expense of giving religious instruction was based. In one sense that was a simple question, but in another sense it was not easy to answer. The subsection read—

> "No part of the expense of giving religious instruction of a special character under this

section shall be paid by the local education authority."

In introducing the Bill the Minister for Education said that the costly administration which the vexatious dual system involved would come to an end under this measure. So far from that expectation being fulfilled under this clause, the difficulty would continue in a more aggravated form than before. It would be more difficult in the future than in the past to apportion the expenses, because there would be two forms of religious instruction given in the same school by different teachers, and very often at the same time. What principle had the Financial Secretary or the Department laid down with regard to the apportionment of the expenses? This was, after all, a matter which did not concern the local authorities. It was one which to a large extent concerned the central department. He also asked why there was such a difference between the wording of this subsection in regard to the payment of the expense and the language used in the analogous sub-section of Clause 4. Under Clause 4 the local authority was only debarred from paying the cost of the teachers. What was the meaning of this distinction?

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 4, to leave out the word 'giving.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said the clause was perfectly straightforward and clear. It laid it down that no part of the expense of giving religious instruction of a special character should be paid by the local education authority. He could scarcely see how, as the noble Lord seemed to imagine, there would be a difficulty in the adjustment of accounts. Some difficulty might arise as between two persons enjoying the same building for different purposes, but here they were dealing simply with the expense attaching to one particular item of instruction, and saying that that expense was not to fall on the local authority. With regard to the other question of the noble Lord, he saw no distinction in substance between the language of Clause 3 and the wording of Clause 4 in this respect.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON pointed out that there was a discrepancy in the wording of Clauses 3 and 4 in regard to this subject. The Solicitor-General had treated the matter as though it were more simple than it really was. The wording of the two clauses pointed to a distinction between the cost of the teaching and the cost of providing books, and premises in a suitable condition for teaching, and perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary might be able to give the House some enlightenment on the subject. The noble Lord who moved the Amendment had referred to the difficulty which would arise in the adjustment of the expenditure, and the difference in the phraseology of the two clauses needed a great deal of explanation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would put one or two questions to the Solicitor-General. Under Clause 3 it was provided that the denomination was to pay for firing, lighting, service, and books, while under Clause 4 the denomination was not to pay for those things, but was to pay a fraction of the teacher's salary. What was the significance underlying the difference of phraseology in the two cases? What they wanted to know was why the Government had adopted phraseology of wholly different significance in the two sections. He had too great confidence in the Government draftsmen not to feel that there was some difference in substance underlying the difference in language. Only one inference could be drawn. The only possible interpretation to be given to the difference of phraseology in the two cases was that there must be something behind it. He would like to know how the allocation of expenditure was to be divided between the local education authority and the denomination? Was it to be on a time principle?

SIR W. ROBSON said that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition seemed to be mixing up the cost of giving religious instruction with the cost of giving facilities for religious instruction, The only thing that was exempt from the obligation of the local authority was the cost of giving religious instruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had waited with anxiety for the explanation. He understood that the Government now laid down that there was a distinction between the cost of giving religious instruction and the cost of granting facilities for religious instruction. He confessed that the distinction had not occurred to him. But he should like to know what constituted the cost of giving religious instruction as distinct from the cost of giving facilities for religious instruction. Was the denomination to pay what he might call the establishment expenses, that was to say, the cost of keeping the school warm, clean, and lighted during that period of the two days per week to be devoted to religious instruction? If the allocation of the cost was to be decided by the local education authority he was sure that it would produce bitterness.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) said he wished to ask what was the precise effect of the Amendment of the hon. Member who proposed to omit the word "giving" in Clause 3.

*MR. SPEAKER said it was not his business to decide that. He supposed the noble Lord moved the Amendment to obtain some enlightment as to what was meant by the word "giving."

DR. MACNAMARA said he was astonished that the right hon. Gentleman did not see why the phraseology was wholly different in Clauses 3 and 4. The effect of Clause 3 was to exclude the teachers, and the purpose of Clause 4 was to include the teachers; but the intention of both clauses was that during the time of religious instruction the cost of heating, lighting, and possibly books was to be a charge upon the local authority.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) thought it was desirable that they should have an interpretation from some one in authority as to the meaning of these words, and that they should not be left to interpret them for themselves or to follow a merely legal construction. He wished to know from the Secretary to the Board of Education whether this provision was in accordance with his own views or with the Code issued by the Education Department. In the Code the questions of instruction and the equipment necessary for instruction were entirely separated and were dealt with in different chapters of the Code. Were they under this Bill providing for a different state of things?

MR. EVELYN CECIL said the point which had been raised was very important and he thought they were entitled to an answer. They ought to know whether the interpretation in regard to facilities under Clause 3 was to be the same as it was under Clause 4. When the Solicitor-General spoke he thought that the interpretation was the same, but notwithstanding the fact that maintenance was included under Clause 4 it was not included under Clause 3.

SIR W. ROBSON said right hon. and hon. Gentlemen seemed to be mixing up the cost of giving religious instruction with the cost of giving facilities for religious instruction. For himself, he drew a distinction between the facilities and the instruction itself. The facilities were one thing, the instruction given in consequence of them was another. The facilities were alike except in the matter of degree under both sections. That was to say under both clauses a school was provided with facilities, and one would assume that it should be a reasonable facility and that it should not be a facility incompatible with the instruction to be given. When once they had given the facilities which were part of the consideration upon which the local authority took over the school, the local authority could not complain of the cost of the facilities, but the facilities having been supplied the cost of instruction did not fall upon the local authority. The only thing that was exempt from the obligation of the local authority was the cost of giving religious instruction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had no right to speak again, but he wished to know whether facilities included maintenance?

Sir W. ROBSON: If the right hon. Gentleman asks my opinion——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I ask for the view of the Government.

Sir W. ROBSON said the Government had not had a Cabinet meeting on this subject, but he was giving the right hon. Gentleman his own opinion and in his view the word did include maintenance.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL said they wanted a statement of the policy of the Government and of the Cabinet, and until they got that he did not think the House was being properly treated. They had had a kind of a statement from the hon. and learned Gentleman which did not carry them very much further than they were before. They were entitled to know whether the maintenance, the lighting and the upkeep of the school, was to be paid for by the local authority or whether it was not, and until they got that information he did not think they could be expected to refrain from going to a division. It was not sufficient for them to have the opinion of the Law Officer of the Crown, excellent, no doubt, as it was; they were entitled to know what was the policy of the Government, and that policy ought to be clearly defined.

Viscount HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) wanted to know, in the absence of the Minister for Education and the incapacity of the Solicitor-General to speak on behalf of the Government, who was entitled to speak on behalf of the Government. They had the Parliamentary Secretary in the House and he surely was competent to statethe viewsof the Government upon this matter, yet they had had no answer to the question put to the Front Bench. The Minister for Education had just come in and was now in his place; he was perfectly confident that they would now get an answer. The question was what was included in the giving of religious instruction. Was it only the cost of the teacher and books or the cost of maintenance and the establishment charges of the school?

*Mr. CAVE said that owing to the answers given by the hon and learned Gentleman this had become rather an important matter. They were now told that, while no part of the expense of giving religious instruction would come out of the rates, the cost of giving facilities for religious teaching would. Or, in other words, that while the salary of the teacher giving religious teaching and the cost of religious books would be provided by the denominations, the apportioned amount of rent and the cost of lighting, heating and other like charges attributable to the religious teaching would be borne by the local authority. He understood that was the opinion of the learned Solicitor-General, than whom there was no man better qualified to give an opinion, but what they desired to know was whether that was the view of the Government.

Mr. BIRRELL said his miserable meal seemed to have given umbrage again. His hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General had given an answer by which he (Mr. Birrell) was perfectly willing to be bound, because it entirely agreed with his own sentiments that the question turned on the meaning of the words "giving religious instruction." The words meant that the local education authority had not to pay a part towards the religious teaching. That was an obligation on the denomination which had to supply the teaching and the books necessary. But the obligation to keep the school going in respect of heating, lighting, and so on would fall on the local education authority.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RAWLINSON moved an Amendment to provide that where there was any dispute as to the facilities granted under Clause 3 there should be a right of appeal to the Board of Education. He might say at once that if the words of the Amendment were not acceptable he would be quite willing to adopt the words of Clause 4. This was an Amendment to which he attached some importance.

It gave a right of appeal where there was any dispute as to the giving of facilities under Clause 3. There was an appeal given with regard to the facilities given under Clause 4, and he saw no reason why the same right of appeal should not be given under Clause 3. They had just finished a discussion upon the question of affording time under this section for the facilities to be given for religious instruction on two mornings a week. The local authority was to determine both the morning and the time. The House knew now that the local authority was also to pay the maintenance charges. Let them assume that the local education authority declined to give reasonable facilities during the religious hour. Let them assume that they refused to give heat or light during that period—and in the opinion of a very large number of Members a very short time ago they would have been within their rights in doing so—much friction would arise. Difficulties must arise with regard to the facilities, and it was for all those reasons that he ventured to urge that this Amendment should be accepted. He ventured to submit that his argument for the Amendment was strengthened by the fact that in Clause 4 where the difficulties that were expected to arise were no greater the right of appeal had already been given. He begged to move.

Mr. LANE-FOX formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 6, at the end, to insert the words, 'If any question arises as to the facilities afforded under this section for the giving of religious instruction of a special character such question may be determined by the Board of Education.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) was unable to admit that the exact wording of the Amendment commended itself to him. He was surprised that the hon. Gentleman had not embodied in the Amendment a bilateral arrangement by which an appeal could be given not merely to the representatives of the school if they did not get the facilities they desired, but also to the local education authority if they did not get the kind of religious instruction for which they bargained.

Mr. RAWLINSON said the Amendment was bilateral.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he was not a lawyer, and he therefore apologised to the hon. Gentleman if he thought this Amendment did not contain a bilateral arrangement. But he was sure the hon. Gentleman would not mind having this made perfectly clear. He would suggest that words should be added such as "religious instruction of a special character," or "having regard to the character of the religious instruction given." This was a matter which undoubtedly required to be dealt with. The local education authority under this Bill made arrangements with the owners or trustees, and one of the conditions was that facilities should be given for religious instruction of a special kind. The special religious instruction for which facilities were to be given would in the case of a Church school be instruction in the principles of the Church of England. Was it to be open to the representatives of the Church in a locality to give any instruction they thought compatible with these principles without any sort of appeal whatsoever? Quite recently manuals of religious instruction for use in Church schools had formed a topic of inquiry, and the greatest exception had been taken to some of them. There were manuals which in the Roman Catholic Church would have a most legitimate position, but which in the Church of England ought not to be circulated at all. This was the kind of thing the local education authority might be confronted with, and he wanted to know what kind of appeal the local education authority would have if the parents came to it and said that they objected to their children on two days a week being instructed in these matters, and called upon the local authority to protect them. Under this Bill there was not the smallest likelihood of any right of appeal. He would read the titles of some of the manuals that had been issued for the instruction of the young in these schools, "Catholic Prayers for the Church of England Pupil," "A Mass Book for Children," "Catholic Devotions for Young People," "Hours with the Blessed Virgin Mary; a Little Office according to the Sarum Breviary." He hoped that hon. Gentlemen opposite, and more particularly the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone, would recognise the fairness of the appeal he was making, and support him in inducing the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment to widen it in the direction he had indicated. He was certain that had it not been for the sort of thing he had alluded to there would never have been this Education Bill or the necessity for it. He did hope even at the eleventh hour some kind of appeal might be possible especially in the rural villages and single school areas in which action of this kind had given rise to intense feeling amongst Nonconformists.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON pointed out that it was for the parents and not the local education authority to inquire into the character of the religious teaching. When any question arose now as to the facilities afforded an appeal was open to the Board of Education. The parents might appeal either to the owners or the local authority to take up their cause, but the local authority could not inquire into the nature of the religious instruction. As the clause now stood if the local authority interposed obstacles in the way of religious instruction there was no appeal to anybody. His hon. friend in his Amendment proposed to give an appeal to the Board of Education. He knew there was a great objection to throwing more work upon the Board of Education, which was already loaded with heavy responsibilities under this Bill, but that was the fault of the Bill and not the fault of the House of Commons. He hoped the Government would agree that there should be an appeal to the Board of Education in cases which he hoped would very rarely arise.

MR. HEDGES (Kent, Tonbridge) said that in the existing state of religious feeling in this country he did not think they could exclude the consideration of those varying opinions of which they had had so many striking illustrations within the last few weeks. They ought to bear in mind the possibility of these difficulties arising. The Amendment contemplated an arrangement by which the difficulties complained of could be settled, but it should not be overlooked that there were difficulties of a more serious nature which should also have an opportunity of settlement. This Amendment had a very distinct bearing on and reference to the previous discussion which had taken place, over which there had been much altercation and difference of opinion. The difficulties which might arise in connection with the taking over of a school seemed to him to be covered by Clause 8, under which the rent and financial arrangements were provided for and regulated. In case difficulties arose in regard to facilities they appeared to be covered by the regulations contained in the clause to which he had referred. He should have thought that the only question which could arise in relation to these difficult matters would be one which would be quite sufficient to restrain the hon. and learned Member opposite from persisting in his Amendment, because the difficulties which would be raised if his Amendment were carried would be very much greater than any relief that could be possibly afforded under it.

MR. BIRRELL confessed that he was somewhat averse to an appeal to the Board of Education under such very wide terms as were now proposed. He could only say that in this matter, as the House already knew, they had left the local education authority to decide questions, much to the annoyance of hon. Gentlemen opposite, as to the accommodation of the schools, and whether the two days should run over into three, four, or five, and it would be impossible for the Board of Education in an appeal under this Bill to override the local authority. Hon. Members talked of an appeal to the Board of Education as though it could by a stroke of the pen produce peace and quiet in the minds of an agitated local authority. That was not the case, and in this matter they were bound, whether they liked it or not, to leave it in the hands of the local authority. The mode in which facilities were to be granted was a very small question indeed, and he could not believe that opportunities for dispute and discussion would arise often. If the local education authority were determined not to take over any schools in which facilities were to be granted they would not take them over. If they were desirous to take them over, he was certain that these facilities—most modest facilities—would not give rise to any sort of dispute at all. He hoped that the class of questions referred to by his hon. friend below the gangway would not arise. "Use and wont" was the substance of this clause, and he hoped that appeals to the Board of Education—not so much to himself for he was already a shadow—would not be numerous. It was a serious drawback that for some years to come there had been imposed on the Board of Education a very heavy task, and the thing was to limit its work to matters of real importance and not to multiply the right of appeal so as to induce people who otherwise would settle matters for themselves to say, "Here the Legislature has suggested a way in which I can settle my grievance, and I insist on the Board of Education adjudicating on this point." He did not ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to be satisfied, but he did ask them to believe that the local education authority, having the matters in their hands, would deal fairly with them to the extent to which the law allowed them to go. On the part of the Board of Education he could not accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 139; Noes, 313. (Division List 258.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt Hn. SirAlexF.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Baring, Hon. Guy(Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach,Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas,Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Farrell, James Patrick
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill,Henry Staveley(Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir JohnH.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Sir HenrySeymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson,Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Redmond, John E. Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith,Abel H (Hertford,East)
Smith,F E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.

Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomson,W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E (Kent, Mid)
Wilson,A Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Rawlinson and Mr Lane-Fox.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H.(Essex,Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex,Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black,Arthur W.(Bedfordshire)
Bolton,T.D.(Derbyshire,N.E)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce,J.A.(Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol,S.)
Dewar,Arthur(Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard. Daniel Ford
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launcest'n
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps,Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hon.E.(Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Warde, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St.Pancras,S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Motion made, and Question, "That further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Birrell*) put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered to-morrow.

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned," (*Mr. Lamont.*)

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) hoped the hon. Member would not persevere with his Motion. The delightful little island of Cumbrae was really dependent on the steamer services of the Glasgow and South Western Railway.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member could only speak to the Motion for the adjournment of the debate.

*MR. COCHRANE said he had no intention of infringing on Mr. Speaker's ruling. What he wanted to say was that an arrangement had been come to under the auspices of the Board of Trade between the railway company and the commissioners of the piers of Millport. The present Bill had absolutely nothing to do with the island of Cumbrae, or with the dispute as to the tolls to be levied at the piers. It dealt only with the purchase of land on the Ayrshire coast and the creation of golf-courses, etc. He ventured to submit that it was an abuse of the rules of the House for an hon. Member to stop the progress of this Bill in order to compel the railway company to consent to something that he wanted. A conference had been arranged under the auspices of the Board of Trade to meet on Friday next, and this was an unwise attempt to endeavour to influence the railway company to grant more favourable terms than they otherwise would do at the conference. This course of procedure would have an exactly opposite effect, and the railway company, if they entered into the conference at all, would do so with a feeling that an endeavour was being made to take an unfair advantage over them. To take this opportunity of postponing the Bill was distinctly against the principle this House should adopt. He had talked with those interested in the promotion of the Bill, and he was interested in the welfare of this part of the country and the island of Cumbrae; and the only effect of postponing the discussion would be that the railway companies would withdraw the Bill. They distinctly said that if the hon. Member persevered in the course he had adopted, they would withdraw and the parts of the country in which he (the hon. Member) was interested would lose the money which would be spent under the Bill. The Glasgow and Western, and the Caledonian railway companies as owners of the steamboats would not enter into negotiations in that friendly spirit they would otherwise adopt toward the borough of Millport, and in every possible way the hon. Member would be doing the greatest injury to the constituency he represented. He hoped they would try to deal with the Bill on its merits. If there was anything in the Bill to which the hon. Member objected on its merits he should state it, but he should not endeavour, himself being a party to this friendly conference between the railway companies and the representatives of Millport to be held on July 27th, to place a weapon in the hands of one party to the dispute to exact terms from the other party. In the interest of the people of Millport and of the hon. Member's own constituency he ought not to adopt his present attitude. The parties should be allowed to meet in friendly conference, without a feeling of resentment being created in the minds of the railway companies at the unfair attempt to upset the honourable undertaking to maintain the *status quo*, which formed the basis of the agreement for the conference, and the prospects of a happy result would then be more favourable.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport) was sorry to say there had been a good deal of heat on both sides in the controversy, and he thought it would be in the interest of all parties to postpone the debate; on Friday the parties concerned would meet. They could not get away from the fact that there had been a good deal of feeling revived on both sides by the Motion, but they were hopeful in the Board of Trade that they would be able to adjust matters, and it was in the interests of that conference that he asked hon. Members to agree to the adjournment of the debate. He was certain it was in the interests of all parties that the debate should be postponed. Reference had been made to blackmailing and endeavouring to extort harsh terms, but of course the hon. Member who was an old Parliamentary hand knew perfectly well that hon. Members had their opportunities and would take advantage of them. The hon. Member was perfectly within his rights in what he had done, but he would press him to agree to the debate's being adjourned. It would be in the interests of all parties, and he was perfectly certain that a settlement would be arrived at.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London) said the Bill was a curious one. It had passed through all its stages in the Private Bill procedure which had been set up in Scotland, and it had also passed the House of Lords. Now on July 24th it had come down to this House. The Motion had been made to adjourn the debate, but no reasons were directly given for it, because the reason which had been assigned was entirely outside the scope of the Bill. The real reason had been admitted by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. Whilst endeavouring to say that blackmailing was wrong, he admitted that attempts to blackmail were being made by saying that hon. Members had their opportunities. What was to be gained by an adjournment? It was late in the session, and it would be impossible for any real consideration to be given to the Bill next week. They sat up the previous night to something like five o'clock, and yet when they had the opportunity within ten days of the adjournment of the House of considering a most important Scottish Bill, they were asked to adjourn the debate! He really thought it would be impossible to transact business in the interests of Private Bill legislation in that manner. Already railway companies had considered whether or not it was advisable ever to attempt to bring Private Bills to this House. Who was going to suffer by that? It would not be the railway companies, it would be the public and the working men. If the hon. Gentleman had any fault to find with any of the provisions of the Bill, now was his opportunity to endeavour to alter or amend those provisions. He did not do that, however, and he (the speaker) hoped that hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House would consider the importance of the matter, and not allow all the money and time which had been spent upon the Bill to be wasted. He remembered in the last Parliament that hon. Members were most anxious that this Private Bill procedure should be set up in Scotland; but what would be the use of it if every Bill which was approved by the Private Bill procedure in Scotland was to be objected to in this House, because hon. Members wanted to put in something which the Bill did not contain, and not because they approved of anything already included.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that hon. Members representing constituencies on the Clyde perhaps knew more about the matter than the hon. Member for the City of London, and he appealed to every Member of the House who was connected in any way whatever with railway interests, as he himself was, to believe that the adjournment was asked for in the interests of the railway company itself, and also in the interests of everyone concerned in the passenger and goods traffic. It would be purely in the interests of all parties, and he sincerely trusted that the House would allow a postponement for a few days in order that this small local matter might be harmoniously got out of the way.

Mr. BONAR LAW said the Board of Trade had to perform an immense amount of work in connection with railway companies which went beyond their statutory powers, and it was perfectly certain that if the impression gained ground among railway companies that they did not get fair play, the right hon. Gentleman would find it much more difficult to carry out the work he desired. It was the duty of the Board of Trade to bring about an arrangement between the parties, but it was rather strong for the Parliamentary Secretary to come down to the House and turn round to one of the parties and say that if they did not adopt the course the majority of the House thought fit, then they would reject the Bill, especially when the matter in dispute had nothing whatever to do with the Bill. He (the speaker) dealt with the matter really without any party feeling. He had interest in the Board of Trade apart from any party, and he should be more sorry than he could express if he got the feeling that that Department was being used for political purposes. [Cries of "Withdraw."] He would not withdraw, unless the Speaker said he had said something which was unparliamentary, because what he had said was absolutely true. The President of the Board of Trade had it in his power to exercise a certain amount of pressure, but, if this Bill were postponed, there was distinct danger that it would be defeated altogether so far as this issue was concerned, for no other cause than that of delay. It was in the power of the right hon. Gentleman if he thought it his duty, and if he thought that the railway company had not acted fairly, to ask the House to reject the Bill on the Third Reading. That would be a strong course, but it might be a justifiable one. The course that he had adopted at the very time he had summoned the Conference—that of telling the railway company that unless it adopted the course approved by the House they would reject the Bill—was one most unfair to the railway company and one which must do harm to the Board of Trade and in the long run be most disastrous to that Department.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said that since he had been a Member of the House he had never heard such a statement as that which had been made by the representative of the Government on the question of blackmailing. He had said that hon. Members had their opportunities and that they would make use of them. That was an extraordinary statement which he had never heard made before. At the time of the general election a certain candidate said that before many years were over the railway companies and other rich corporations would have reason to quail. After the statement of the hon. Gentleman he should say that they would certainly have reason to do so. He sincerely hoped the Motion would be pressed to a division.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said he recently had the privilege of moving a Resolution in connection with the Brighton Railway to the effect that, if the railway company sought additional powers, they should not be granted to them if they used their existing powers in a mischievous way. On that occasion the Board of Trade recognised the suggestion he put forward, and he ventured to say that railway companies should not be given additional monopoly powers when they were trying to use their existing powers in a manner contrary to the intentions of Parliament. He thought the suggestion of the President of the Board of Trade deserved every consideration, and he considered it was extremely objectionable to call it blackmailing when the House simply asked that the railway company should treat the public in a reasonable manner.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said the Board of Trade had taken no sides in the matter at all, and he thought the railway companies admitted that there was a dispute between the Millport people and the railway company. The Board of Trade had expressed no opinion upon it at present. He had seen representatives of the railway company and also of the Millport people, but he had expressed no opinion on either side. All they had done up to the present was to try and intervene in the interests of a settlement. They had arranged a meeting that week between the railway company and the Millport representatives, and his own opinion was that a friendly arrangement would be arrived at. He thought it exceedingly undesirable that the instruction on the Paper, for which they were not in the slightest degree responsible, should be debated before the meeting on Friday. If they were going to have a meeting between the parties with a view to arriving at a reasonable and friendly understanding, he could conceive nothing worse than a keen debate, which would be sure to ensue on the matter in dispute between them. It would be exceedingly irritating, and it was perfectly certain it would make the work of the Board of Trade futile. All they desired in the matter was that there should be no debate at all until they met on Friday. It would only create temper, which would be fatal to anything in the nature of a solution. He was sure it would be in the interests of the railway company, as well as of the Millport people, that nothing should be said on the merits of the dispute until that meeting. He had heard something about blackmailing and threats Those threats had not emanated from the Board of Trade. The only threat he had heard had emanated from the other side of the House, and he was very sorry to have heard it. He thought it was in the best interests of all parties that the matter should be held over. The Bill would be in no danger from the fact of its being put over, and he appealed to hon. Members to allow the debate to be adjourned.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said the Bill came before the House in exactly the same way as a Bill which had come from a Private Bill Committee upstairs, and he submitted that the House should forthwith proceed to discuss it. There had been no case shown why the Bill should not be dealt with now, nor had the Board of Trade shown any reason why the Conference which had been spoken of—the object of which did not appear to be clear—should be taken into consideration and the Bill postponed in consequence.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said they must get at the hidden meaning of the Motion for adjournment. It came from a private secretary to the Prime Minister. If it was the intention of the Government to give the Bill a fair chance of passing this session, the private secretary to the Prime Minister would not have been put up in order to move the adjournment of the debate. He urged, as a Scotsman, that, when Scottish Bills, whether private or public, came before the House for consideration, there should not be this sort of intrigue in order to prevent their having a full chance of passing before the House adjourned. This was not the first occasion during the last two weeks that Private Bills had been subjected to treatment unworthy of the British Parliament, and so long as Scottish Bills were treated in this way, his voice would be raised against any Motion designed to defer Scottish legislation for the benefit of Party intrigue.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 276; Noes, 65. (Division List No. 259.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell J.H.(Essex, Romford)
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D. (Derbyshire,N.E.)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce,J.A.(InvernessBurghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S. Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hammond, John
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'gh
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip

Mr. Claude Hay.

Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius
Bowles. G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Roland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Younger, George.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Mitchell Thomson.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

DOGS BILL.

As amended (by the standing Committee) considered.

Lord R. CECIL said that a change in the law had been needed for a great many years, and this Bill afforded the House an opportunity of effecting it. At present an owner was not responsible for any injury which his dog inflicted upon other dogs or human beings, unless it could be shown that the dog was known to be of an evil disposition likely to cause injury. The law was summarised shortly by saying that every dog was permitted to have one bite. He had always thought that unjust. A man was responsible for all the acts of his agents, and it was ridiculous to suppose that one could be aware of the intentions of one's agent or know sufficiently of that extremely complex subject, the tendency of the human mind, to be aware of what he was likely to do under any circumstances. A coachman, for instance, might get drunk and run into something whilst in charge of a vehicle, but in that case the coachman's employer was responsible for the damage, not on the absurd ground that he was responsible for his agent getting drunk, but because it would be monstrously unjust for the person who was injured to suffer the damage. That was the true principle on which the law should rest, and it was plain that it should apply to dogs as well as to anything else. Anyone who chose to own an animal which was capable of being dangerous, should take sufficient precaution to prevent it doing an injury, and he did not believe there was any possible logical reason why one should not be responsible for the injury done by a dog. He ventured to mention this subject when the Bill was before the House on the Second Reading, and since that time he had received many communications from various parts of the country, speaking of the very serious injury done by dogs to poor people without there being the slightest remedy against the owners, and he could himself conceive that great hardship was constantly being inflicted by people who owned dogs not taking sufficient care to keep them within control. He felt very strongly on the subject. He thought a change of the law was eminently desirable, and that it could be accomplished under the Bill with the greatest possible ease. The Amendment he proposed was simply to strike out the words "to any cattle." It would make the clause read, "The owner of a dog shall be liable in damages for injury done by that dog."

Lord CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out the words 'to any cattle.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said that the reason the Amendment was not made when the Bill was before the Standing Committee was that the Committee appreciated the fact that it was not a Bill dealing with the whole question of dogs, but one dealing only with questions of injury done to live stock by dogs. The Bill was brought in by the late Government at the request of the Central Chamber of Agriculture to deal with the question of injury done by dogs to cattle, and the present Government considered that they should follow on the same lines in order to carry out the unsuccessful attempt of the Party opposite. The noble Lord's Amendment would go much beyond that, and would extend the scope of the Bill further than was contemplated. It would make the words read "injury done by the dog," and that would include injury of every possible kind. A dog in search of a rabbit might go among corn and create damage. The effect of the Amendment would be that the owner of the dog would have to pay the damage. That would open up all sorts of complications, and he thought the House would agree that it was desirable they should limit the Bill to the purpose for which it was introduced—to enable a farmer who had his sheep worried by dogs to recover compensation. He hoped the noble Lord would not persist in his Amendment. It would complicate the Bill, the one object of which was to put a stop to the worrying of sheep or other live stock upon farms. The larger question as to whether a dog was entitled to his first bite might be a proper question of discussion on another occasion, but here they had only to consider whether it was desirable to amend the law in order that a farmer should be able to protect himself from the great injury which was constantly arising from sheep being worried and flocks being disturbed and chased.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) said it was with great regret that he found himself unable to agree with the noble Lord; he hoped the Government would not accept the Amendment. He personally was the owner of dogs, and he could hardly agree that owners were not responsible for what their dogs did, because on one occasion one of his dogs bit somebody's leg, and he had to pay damages. He would like to ask the noble Lord whether a dog kept in a house for the purpose of preventing the entrance of burglars would render its master liable to pay damages if it bit a burglar's leg.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said it was not often that he found himself in accord with hon. Members opposite, but he did so on this occasion. He thought that the hon. Baronet had explained the objections to the Amendment very clearly. The Bill was one to deal with injury caused to live stock, and it was not one dealing with human beings.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he was entirely opposed to anything in the nature of class legislation. He did not believe in picking out a particular class and making it responsible for something for which other people were not responsible. It appeared to him that as it stood the Bill was a very bad one. If the owner of a dog was to be made responsible for damages to cattle, it appeared to him to be only equitable and just that he should be made responsible if it did injury to a human being. Surely human beings were of more importance than cattle. He ventured to suggest that the poorest beggar who came to a man's door was just as much entitled to be protected as a farmer's cattle. If a man had a vicious dog and he was to be liable for any injury done by it to cattle, then it seemed to him only logical and just that he should be liable for any injury it did in any other way. It was quite clear that a dog might cause injury to live stock without doing that injury itself. A dog might conceivably damage a fence and the cattle might sustain injury in consequence of the damage. He respectfully submitted that, if the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill wished to protect cattle against injury which might arise from the unlawful acts of dogs, it would be far better to leave out the words "to any cattle," in order to make the provision generally applicable.

LORD R. CECIL said that it was evident the sense of the House was very much against him, and, much as he regretted it, he would therefore ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) proposed to leave out sub-section (2) of Clause 1. He said it would be observed that the sub-section placed upon individuals suspected of being the owners of dogs which had inflicted injury the onus of proving that they were not the owners. If there was any difficulty in ascertaining the owner of a dog, there might be some justification for this, but it should be remembered that every owner of a dog had to possess a licence, and that there was no difficulty in tracing such owner. He could easily imagine that persons of a kind disposition who allowed stray dogs to sleep upon their premises might find themselves liable to pay heavy damages if any of those dogs proved to be of vicious disposition. Whilst, therefore, in favour of giving every protection to farmers who suffered damage by reason of depredations by dogs, he could not agree to a clause of this kind which might easily inflict a very great hardship and for which he could see no necessity.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 1."—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said the sub-section was simply a re-enactment of the present law. The hon. Member who moved to omit the sub-section had said there was no difficulty in tracing the owner of a dog, but very often there was a difficulty. He also seemed to maintain that a person taking in a stray dog would be made liable for any injury done by that dog. That would not be the case unless he harboured the dog for some unlawful purpose and did not hand it over to the police as he ought to do. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) supported the Amendment. The case might arise, he said, where one dog was kept in a garden common to fifty flats. That dog might do damage, and he wished to ask how were they to presume that a particular person living in one of those flats owned the animal? It was past his comprehension. He hoped they would not adopt the principle of throwing the burden upon an individual of proving that he did not own a dog which had inflicted injury. They might have a particularly hard case where a person was mulcted in heavy costs even though he won the action and disproved the ownership of the dog. He hoped the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill would not proceed with the clause.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said that there was no new principle in the clause. The clause was almost word for word the same as that of the Act of 1865, and he did not think there had ever been any great complaint of injustice caused by it. He would point out that the Bill was designed to assist the agricultural community. The agricultural community had been clamouring for the Bill for years, and year after year it had been brought in. He did not think, however, there had ever been such a good opportunity as the present of putting it on the Statute Book. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member in charge of the Bill would decline to accept the Amendment.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said there was one reason why the sub-section was necessary, and he hoped the hon. Member who moved the Amendment would not press it. If the sub-section were struck out, it would be open to anyone who harboured a dog to deny its ownership altogether. It might be that a farmer's dog would get out at night and worry his neighbour's sheep. If the police traced the dog to a house, and there was no provision to say that the tenant of the house would be presumed to be the owner of the dog which was kept, or permitted to live, or remained upon the premises, it was quite obvious that there would be a great opening for the denial of ownership, and therefore he hoped in the agriculturists' interests, that the sub-section would not be omitted.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) said he hoped the hon. Member would press his Amendment to a division. It seemed to him that in all new legislation they were introducing the novelty of making every man prove his innocence, and, however much he was opposed to dogs wandering about the country and injuring animals, he was not in favour of throwing that onus upon individuals.

*MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) said he hoped that the Amendment would not be accepted by the House for he was sure no hon. Member who administered justice at petty sessions would for a moment advocate omitting the words against which the Amendment was directed, having regard to the difficulties they experienced in connection with Inland Revenue summonses for keeping dogs without a licence, for they would remember the numerous subterfuges adopted to deny the ownership of dogs. The hon. Member for Denbigh had spoken about a dog in a garden common to fifty flats, but they knew sufficient of human nature to know that a man who was sought to be made liable for the evil conduct of such a dog would not hesitate to give his neighbour away, and that the police would soon come to the right conclusion as to who was the owner of the dog. He did not think, therefore, it was any reason why they should object to include this most useful sub-section in the Bill. Much that had been said about the hardship of shifting the burden of proof from the prosecution and compelling a person to prove his innocence, or that the dog did not belong to him was much exaggerated; it was indeed carrying the matter very far when the question was one of a dog being found on premises over which that person purported or claimed to exercise control. There were many instances known to the law where the onus was upon the accused, and a parallel case was afforded where a person was found to have in his possession or upon his premises property which had been stolen. When a person was in possession of property, he was presumed to exercise control over it.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover) said the sub-section to him seemed to be a most useful one, and he hoped the hon. Baronet would persist in it.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the sub-section was absolute nonsense. It would oblige an accused person to prove his innocence, whereas it ought to be necessary for the prosecution to make out a man's guilt. If a dog were kept in the house, it was perfectly obvious that it could not be running about doing damage. The clause was quite unworkable. If he met a dog and did not shoot it, he should be permitting it to live. Was he, however, because he permitted that dog to live, to be responsible for any damage it did? He had never read such nonsense in his life, and he trusted the House would pass the Amendment.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said the sense of the House was obviously against the Amendment, and he, therefore, begged leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) proposed to insert after the word "swine," on page 2, the words "dogs, turkeys, chicken, ducks, and geese." He said the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had stated that the object of the measure was to prevent injury to live stock by dogs. The clause as it stood provided that the definition of "cattle" should include horses, mules, asses, sheep, goats, and swine. It seemed to him, however, that if a man's live stock was to be protected, as it ought to be, from the ravages of piratical dogs, he was entitled to have his chickens protected as well as his cattle. Moreover, he believed it was the general experience that the damage done by dogs to chickens, turkeys, and birds generally was quite as great as that done to cattle. The adoption of his Amendment would make the Bill more comprehensive and satisfactory from every point of view.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 2, after the word 'swine' to insert the words 'dogs, turkeys, chickens, ducks, and geese.'"—(*Mr. H. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he would point out to the hon. Member that the definition of the word "cattle" had already had the decision of the courts, and he considered it inadvisable that they should extend that definition in this Bill.

MR. CLAUDE HAY urged that if the courts had neglected the desires of the people of this country, the House was surely competent to make alterations if it thought fit? If that were not so, why had the Government introduced the Bill at all? He was in favour of the suggested extension of the definition of the word "cattle."

VISCOUNT TURNOUR asked the hon. Baronet to accept the Amendment. The spirit and intention of the Bill was to prevent a dog being kept which did injury to live stock of any kind. Far more damage was done to fowls and turkeys than to sheep and cattle. If they were going to define cattle as including horses, mules, asses, sheep, goats and swine, he did not see why they should not include turkeys and chickens as well. A dog had more chances of chasing fowls on the roadside than it had of chasing sheep in a field. The dog had his opportunity, and he would use it. The agricultural Members on both sides were in favour of the Amendment.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY hoped the hon. Baronet would not accept the Amendment as it stood, because it would make the clause perfectly ridiculous. There was a good deal in the suggestion of the Amendment, however, and he hoped the hon. Baronet would see his way to insert some words which would give the same effect without extending the definition of the word "cattle" in a way which would be awkward when dealing with other statutes.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 31; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 260.)

AYES.

Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Lynch, H. B.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Mara, James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Wedgwood, Josiah C.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Harry Marks and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex. E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Farrell James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmlsey, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hunt, Rowland
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richarsdon, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Starkey, John R.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)

Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thornton, Percy M.
Toulmin George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J.A.Pease.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY said he moved to omit the words "chased or" in line 3 on page 2. The clause as it stood was a very drastic one, and he appealed to the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill to accept his Amendment. It would be possible under the clause for a person to be summoned because his dog chased some sheep on the road, even although no injury was caused. He was in favour of the Bill, but he hoped the hon. Baronet would be reasonable, and would not make the Bill so drastic that it would be hard on the owner of a dog which had done no injury. It might be said that at certain times the injury was caused to sheep from the very fact that they were chased, but that case would not be affected by the Amendment, because the words still remained: "Where a dog is proved to have injured sheep." If a dog caused injury, it would be able to be dealt with under the Act of 1871. The omission of the words "chased or" would not in any way weaken the sub-section, whilst at the same time it would prevent a dog being destroyed under the Dogs Act, 1871, when it had not done any harm.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 3, to leave out the words 'chased or.'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'chased or' stand part of the Bill."

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY said the Amendment would be very well if it was merely a question of a few sheep being chased on the road. The object of the sub-section, however, was to prevent the chasing of a flock of ewes in a field, and he was sure the hon. Baronet would realise that very serious damage often resulted from ewes in lamb being chased. The object of the clause was to throw liability on the owner who allowed his dog to roam about at night and chase sheep. If the Amendment were adopted, they would have to prove injury, whereas injury might occur some time afterwards. It was therefore very necessary to have the words "chased or" retained. The question had been thoroughly discussed and considered, and he was perfectly certain he should meet with no contradiction from hon. Members interested in sheep when he said it was absolutely necessary to retain the words if they were to protect agriculturists from having their flocks damaged by the ewes being chased when in lamb.

Viscount TURNOUR said he was very glad to hear that the hon. Baronet would not accept the Amendment, because it would injure the effect of the Bill. It was impossible at the time to say whether sheep were injured or not. Nobody ought to keep a dog which was in the habit of chasing sheep. Such dogs were a great nuisance to farmers, and he was very pleased the hon. Baronet had refused to accept the Amendment.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY appealed to his hon. friend to withdraw his Amendment, and asked him to turn back to the origin of the Bill and to remember the resolutions which came from the agricultural societies. The whole gist of the reason why the Board of Agriculture took the matter up was in the sub-section. The chief ground of objection to dogs was the chasing of sheep at a particular period, and this sub-section was most important. The omission of the words "chased or" would do away with a great deal of the good of the Bill, and he therefore earnestly appealed to his hon. friend not to press his Amendment.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. **BOLAND** (Kerry, S.) said he desired to move an Amendment to insert in Clause 2, after line 13, on page 2, the words "Provided always in Ireland it shall be lawful for the owner of a dog to have his name and address inscribed on the collar in Irish characters." His reason for moving the Amendment was to do away with unnecessary prosecutions. They had in the last few years witnessed in Ireland a number of ridiculous prosecutions undertaken by the police against men who had put their names on carts in Irish and who had taken out dog licences in Irish. His Amendment would do away with the necessity of those prosecutions. It was his firm belief that the moment the Bill became law a great majority of Irish people would inscribe their names in Irish on their dog collars, and if they gave them permission to do that in the Act they would do away with the necessity of prosecutions which would otherwise undoubtedly take place. He suggested that the words should be inserted here, but if the hon. Baronet or the Attorney-General for Ireland thought that words could be better inserted in a later part of the Bill which dealt specifically with Ireland, he would be quite ready to have them so inserted.

Mr. **HUGH LAW** (Donegal, W.) seconded. He said he knew a young man in his constituency who had been imprisoned for over a week simply because he signed his name in Irish when applying for a dog licence.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 13, after the word 'thereto' to insert the words 'Provided always that in Ireland it shall be lawful for the owner of a dog to have his name and address inscribed on the collar in Irish characters.'"—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir **EDWARD STRACHEY** said he was sorry he must refuse to accept the Amendment. A man would be unable to return a stray dog to the owner or give notice to the police if the owner's name and address was inscribed on the collar in Irish and he was unable to read it.

Mr. **O'MARA** (Kilkenny, S.) said he was surprised the hon. Baronet had refused to accept the Amendment. Of course, he had not been in Ireland for many years, but in parts of that country the bulk of the people spoke very good Irish and would be unable to read the name and address on a dog's collar if they were in English, whereas if they were in Irish it would be for the public convenience. He therefore appealed to the hon. Baronet to accept the Amendment and facilitate the passage of the Bill. He should have the greatest possible objections to the Bill if the permission suggested were not accorded; and the passage of the measure would be very much more difficult if the Amendment were not accepted.

Mr. **SHEEHAN** (Cork County, Mid.) supported the Amendment. He said there were a number of agriculturists in Ireland desirous of registering their dogs in Irish. They looked upon it from the point of view of sentiment. They were anxious that they should register their dogs in the language of the people, and he thought that was a very reasonable request to make. He therefore supported the Amendment and asked the hon. Baronet to reconsider the matter.

Mr. **CREAN** said he could not understand how the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill could have any objection to accepting the Amendment at the request of the Irish Members. It could do no harm to the Bill. The man stood to lose his dog if his name and address were not intelligibly on the collar. The Irish people were anxious that they should be allowed to use Irish, but under the Amendment the use of the language would not be compulsory. He failed to see that the hon. Baronet was justified by any logical reason in withholding the privilege for which they asked. In fact, he thought they should not ask for it as a privilege, but as a matter of right. They were told they were to be governed according to Irish ideas, and he would like to ask the hon. Baronet what logical reason there was why the Irish people should not be permitted to do this simple thing.

Mr. **HAZELTON** (Galway, N.) said he would like to join in the appeal to the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill to accept the Amendment. When they complained of the treatment of their language they were told that it was not the fault of the Government but the fault of previous legislation for which they could accept no responsibility. Here, however, they were making a new Act of Parliament, and yet the Liberal Government refused to express small and practical sympathy with the Irish people in the matter. The point raised was small, but it had to do with an important principle upon which Irishmen felt strongly and deeply. It was absurd that whilst they might sign their names in the Roll of the House of Commons and on cheques in Irish they should not be allowed by this Liberal Government to put their names in Irish on their dog collars. It was an extraordinary position for a Liberal Government to take up, and he hoped the Minister in charge of the Bill would reconsider the matter and accept the Amendment.

MR. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.) said he did not think the refusal arose from any lack of sympathy with the Irish people. The clause simply gave power to the Board of Agriculture to make orders from time to time. There was an Irish Department of Agriculture, and there was no reason why the Department should not say in their regulations that owners might put their names in Irish characters on their dog collars.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that no doubt, as he read the clause, it would be possible for the Board of Agriculture to do as the hon. Member had suggested, but, unfortunately, in dealing with Irish Boards, they could not expect that they would, as a matter of course, act in accordance with public opinion as no doubt English Boards would in England. He would ask, however, whether there was really any practical difficulty in acceding to the request contained in the Amendment. He and his colleagues really had no desire to trouble or detain the House, and they would not have raised the point if they had not considered it a substantial one. If the Bill were passed in its present form there would undoubtedly be a certain number of people in Ireland who would put their names on their dog collars in Irish, and the result would be that penalties would be imposed upon them if the Bill were not amended as they suggested. Nobody desired that. All that they asked was that it should be left optional. The hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill made light of the matter and said that if a dog was found with a name in Irish on its collar no one would be able to read it or know to whom the dog belonged. He was sure the hon. Baronet did not mean that. He knew enough about Ireland to know that in every part there were people who understood Irish and who could read it, and that in some parts Irish was the language generally spoken. He certainly thought they were not asking too much from the Government. It would obviate ridiculous prosecutions such as had been instituted from time to time, but which, he was glad to say, had ceased owing to the good sense of the present executive. They were most desirous of facilitating the passage of the Bill, and he would remind the hon. Baronet that in the divisions taken they had supported the Government. They thought the Bill was a good one, and he would therefore urge upon the hon. Baronet to make this small concession gracefully to the Irish Members. They were not asking very much, and it could not possibly interfere with the efficiency of the Bill. Even if it had no practical effect in Ireland, a little concession to sentiment in the matter would do no harm to anybody. It would not injure the Bill and would, he thought, on the whole be grateful to the general feeling of the House.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said he was sure the hon. Member for Waterford would believe him when he said that he had every sympathy with what he said as regarded the use of Irish in Ireland. The Government had every desire to facilitate the study of the Irish language and the use of the Irish language as much as possible in Ireland, and they had taken steps in reference to the matter in the elementary schools; but in this case it should be remembered that there were a great number of people in Ireland who did not understand the Irish language. There was nothing, however, to prevent the name being put in both languages if any owner of a dog desired it. It was necessary to ascertain the ownership of a dog, and it was desirable and important that the name should appear in the English language in those parts where the Irish language was not generally spoken. There were many parts of Ireland where there were very few people indeed who knew the Irish language, but he thought if his hon. friend would withdraw the Amendment the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill would undertake to consider the question and see if some clause could not be introduced at a later stage. He might certainly promise that they would consider any suggestion with reference to the use of the Irish language. The Amendment had been sprung suddenly upon the House, and it could not be considered in a moment, but the Government was anxious to do what it could.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman when he suggests it can be considered?

*Mr CHERRY: It may be considered in another place.

Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER (Croydon) said that he understood it was a House of Lords Bill, and he thought it would be much better to have the question made quite clear. He did not understand whether the Attorney-General meant that Irish might be used exclusively for this purpose or not. What they wanted to know was to whom a dog belonged and whence it came, and it would be idle to suppose that nine out of ten would know what the inscription on a collar meant if it were in Irish. Let them take Dublin. There was not one person out of ten there who had ever spoken or written Irish. Were they to make the law ridiculous and compel people to forfeit the whole benefit of the law by the adoption of this Amendment?

*Viscount TURNOUR said it was a very simple and small matter whether the Amendment was accepted by the Government or not, but he strongly protested against the way in which the Government had behaved. The representative of the Board of Agriculture had said he could not accept the Amendment and had given good reasons for not doing so—or rather what he considered were good reasons. Some might think them good reasons and others might think they were bad but everyone would admit he had spoken strongly against the proposed Amendment. Pressure was then put upon the Government from the Irish Benches in order to make them accept the Amendment. If it was not accepted the Nationalists said the Bill would be fought for the rest of the evening. The Attorney-General then got up and in a speech in which during the first part no one could understand whether he would accept the Amendment or not, he stated that the Amendment would be considered at another stage. Why in the name of reason could not the Amendment be accepted now? It was not a question in which further discussion was needed? He hoped the hon. Gentleman who moved this Amendment would not withdraw it, but would enable this question to be settled, and not allow the Government to shuffle off by saying it would be settled at a later stage. It would not be settled at a later stage, and they would be left in the same unsatisfactory position.

*Mr. BOLAND said he should be perfectly satisfied to leave the matter over on the clear understanding that the Irish language could be used by itself. The suggestion that provision should be made for the use of the two languages at the same time was no concession at all. The legal obligation would then be fulfilled by the use of English, and the Irish inscription would be merely ornamental, like the studs on the collar.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY said that it should be remembered that in consequence of pressure from the Irish Members the Attorney-General got up and said his hon. friend in charge of the Bill would consider the matter. He, however, had forgotten that they were on the Report stage, and that the only means of carrying out his pledge was by using the influence of the Government in the House of Lords to insert the necessary Amendment. Though the Liberal Government denounced the House of Lords the fact remained that this Home Rule Ministry was compelled to rely upon the House of Lords to pull it out of the mire, and the Irish Nationalists had to turn to the House of Lords for protection against a Home Rule Government; in short the only means by which Irish grievances could be redressed when Home Rulers held the reins of power was by an appeal to the House of Lords to do that which Ministers refused in the House of Commons.

*MR. BOLAND asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY proposed to leave out "seven" in Clause 3, page 2, line 31, in order to insert "fourteen." He considered seven days would be a very short time in the case of an owner who happened to be abroad, and that great hardships might thus arise. "Fourteen" days on the other hand would make it certain that the owner would receive the notice and thus have a chance of saving his dog from being killed. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

MR. O'MARA seconded. He thought the Amendment very reasonable. Seven days appeared to him much too short a period for the purpose. A dog was often held in dear affection, and it would be a cruel thing if such a dog were destroyed without the owner having a chance of saving its life. He therefore strongly supported the Amendment, which, he thought, ought to obtain the assent of the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill. He knew that that hon. Gentleman was a very reasonable and sensible man, and although he made a slight mistake in judgment in regard to the last Amendment, he thought he would see that this was a reasonable and sensible proposal.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.—

"In page 2, line 31, to leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'fourteen.'—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the Bill."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that in spite of what the hon. Baronet had said he could not help thinking that it was rather ungrateful on his part to move the Amendment, because in Committee upstairs he accepted seven days in place of five. A further extension would throw great difficulty upon the police and the dogs' homes where accommodation was limited, and although he had every sympathy with the desire that the longest possible time should be given to the owners of dogs and should himself be prepared to go further, he was assured that it was quite impossible to do so.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'destroyed' to insert the words 'in a manner to cause as little pain as possible."—(*Mr. Thornton.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, after the word 'shilling,' to insert the words 'Every home to which dogs are taken by the police shall be required to keep a register giving a brief description of each dog received, the name of the police station from which it was received, with the date, and the manner in which it has been disposed of. Every such register shall be open to inspection by any member of the public on payment of one shilling.'"—(*Mr. Weir.*)

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) seconded.

Question, "That those words be therein inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 2, at beginning to insert 'but such consent shall not be withheld if the court is of opinion that the conditions for exemption mentioned in the said section are duly complied with on the part of the applicant.'"—(*Mr. Cathcart Wason.*)

MR. WEIR seconded.

Question, "That those words be therein inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed:—

"In page 4, line 10, at end, add, "'(3) No fee shall be payable in respect of any application or consent under this section.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

MR. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark) proposed to leave out the words "a sheep" in Clause 6, page 4, line 12, in order to insert "any cattle." He said that it seemed to him that the clause as it stood at present took too narrow a view. If it was advisable—and it certainly was—that the carcases of sheep should be buried, it was equally advisable that any larger animals should be buried. There was more likelihood that the carcases of large animals would remain unburied than the carcases of sheep, because their burial would cause more trouble; and he would ask the hon. Baronet if he could not accept the Amendment in view of the fact that the carcases of unburied animals might entice dogs from their homes and lead to sheep worrying.

Captain FABER seconded the Amendment. He did so, he said, in the interests of agriculture.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 12, to leave out the words "a sheep" and insert the words 'any cattle.'" (*Mr. Starkey.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 14, to leave out the word summary.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question, "That the word 'summary' stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 14, after the word 'conviction,' to insert the words 'under the Summary Jurisdiction Act.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted," put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, at end, to add the words "(d) Until the first day of January nineteen hundred and twelve section five shall not apply to any application for the renewal of a certificate of exemption in force at the date of the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. Crombie.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Mr. Starkey.

CROWN LANDS (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

PUBLIC TRUSTEES [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the Consolidated Fund of such sums as may be required to make good any liabilities incurred by the Public Trustee, or his officers, appointed under any Act of the present session to provide for the appointment of a Public Trustee, and to authorise the payments, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of the salaries or remuneration of the Public Trustee and his officers, and of other expenses incurred by them in pursuance of such Act."

Resolution agreed to.

INFECTIOUS DISEASE (IRELAND) BILL.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) asked the Attorney-General for Ireland to explain why the Infectious Diseases (Notification) Act should apply compulsorily and why the Bill had been introduced.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) said there was a short memorandum on the Bill stating its object. A number of Resolutions had been passed in favour of it, and the Government had been pressed on many sides to bring it in.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

CHARITABLE LOAN SOCIETIES (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House on the 13th July.

House adjourned at twenty-six minutes before Two o'clock.

about a settlement of the claims of the evicted tenants.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that five policemen are on special duty in connection with the Lamphier estate. The relations between the police and the people are stated to be most friendly, with the exception of a few families who are in sympathy with applicants for farms on the estate mentioned. I am informed that it is not the fact that on 12th July the police either assaulted Martin Moore or threatened Johanna Cormack. These persons were disorderly, and the police are stated to have treated them with much forbearance and to have merely cautioned them as to their conduct. There is no ground for the suggestion that the police were under the influence of drink. I have already informed the hon. Member that the persons who claim to be evicted tenants are not such, but surrendered their farms for monetary compensation. The Estates Commissioners have no power to interfere in the matter. The property was sold some time ago.

Sale of Mr. Courtenay Croker's Moohane Estate.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether in the sale to the tenants of the estate of Mr. Courtenay Croker, in Moohane, parish of Herbertstown and county Limerick, Michael Power, the evicted tenant, or Timothy Kirby, planter on the farm, has been recognised by the Estates Commissioners as the purchasing tenant; have the Estates Commissioners sent their inspector on the lands to interview Mr. Power, and the planter, and, if so, what has been the result; is he aware that the planter promised the agent, Mr. J. B. Barrington, that he would resign the farm provided he got another farm of equal value on the Croker estate; and will the Estates Commissioners further use their offices in bringing in an arrangement so as to restore Power to his farm.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have now received their inspector's report on the application of Michael Power for reinstatement in his former holding, now occupied by Timothy Kirby. The Commissioners understand that Kirby is not prepared to surrender the farm, and they have no information as to whether he at any time promised to do so. The Commissioners have not yet dealt with the estate of Mr. Courtenay Croker which is the subject of proceedings before them. If the Commissioners should be unable to effect the restoration of Power to his former holding, they will consider his application in connection with the purchase of any untenanted land on the estate or in the neighbourhood.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the right hon. Gentleman ask the Commissioners to make some further inquiries as to whether the tenant in occupation of the farm has actually offered to go if a new farm is provided for him elsewhere? Cannot these inquiries be made before the sale is completed, as manifestly it would be better to put the old tenant back in his old home and the new tenant into a new farm?

MR. BRYCE: If the hon. Gentleman will put the facts on paper I will communicate them to the Estates Commissioners.

Irish Questions.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, when starred Questions are not reached on the Paper, he will consider the possibility of sending a printed Answer in the same way as other Ministers.

*MR. BRYCE: The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension. When a Question addressed to me, which requires an oral Answer, is not reached during the time set apart for Questions, I invariably cause my Answer to be printed and circulated with the votes, in accordance with the standing orders, and copies of my Answers are also left at the back of Mr. Speaker's chair for the use of hon. Members.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I am under no misapprehension. Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that other Ministers post copies of these replies to the individual Members who put them down?

*Mr. BRYCE: I am not aware of that; I am following the practice which I found when I came to the Irish Office. I would remind hon. Members that I have to answer nearly as many Questions as all the other Ministers put together, and I believe the practice of leaving the Answer behind the Speaker's chair is on the whole the most convenient.

Corporation of Dublin Clerkships.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that although the Corporation of Dublin have issued a programme of examination for clerkships the successful competitors have subsequently to secure appointment by the ordinary course of election; and whether he will make representations to the corporation with the view of inducing that body to throw its clerkships open to public competition.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Have not the Dublin Corporation followed exactly the same course as the Belfast Corporation in this matter?

*Mr. BRYCE: I cannot say as to that The Local Government Board have no official information upon the subject of the Question. The Board, however, are aware that correspondence upon the subject has appeared in the newspapers, including a letter from the City Treasurer of Dublin explaining that the practice of the Dublin Corporation in the matter of these examinations has been for years precisely the same as that which prevails with the London County Council, the successful candidates being appointed in order of merit. It is not within the province of the Local Government Board to make representations to the corporation as to the manner in which they fill their clerkships.

Mr. T. Rorke, J.P.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. John Dowd, of Ryfield, Elphin, county Roscommon, has reported to the Lord Chancellor that Mr. T. Rorke, J.P., had threatened him that if he did not give up the land that he grabbed from Bernard Heaney, he would make it hot for him; whether any inquiry has been made into this allegation; and whether any, and if so, what, action is to be taken in the matter.

*Mr. BRYCE: The Lord Chancellor informs me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Lord Chancellor caused inquiries to be made into the allegation, and, as it was not borne out, he decided that there were no sufficient grounds for taking action.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that an emergency man quite recently threatened to shoot the police placed there for his protection?

*Mr. BRYCE: I am not aware of that, but I am happy to think that the threat, if made, was not carried out.

Alleged Lawlessness in Galway.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of the Judge at the last Galway assizes, that portions of the county were in a state of extreme lawlessness, that thirty-three people are under special police protection, that intimidation is very prevalent in the east riding, that very little freedom of thought or action is allowed to the inhabitants in the matter of tenure of land, that the town of Loughrea and its immediate neighbourhood is in a very bad state, and a reign of terror may be said to exist there always; and will he say whether these statements have been considered by the Executive Government and what action is to be taken in the matter.

Mr. BRYCE: I have seen a newspaper report of the learned Judge's address to the Grand Jury, in which he is reported to have made the remarks attributed to him in the Question. It is obvious from the report that the Judge was referring to portions of the east riding of the county only, and I observe that he commented on the fact that, taking the county as a whole, there had been a very substantial decrease in the number of offences. I am informed by the police authorities that a great improvement is taking place in the condition of Loughrea, where public feeling was recently excited over a specific case. The police are fully alive to their duty of preserving the peace, and adequate steps to that end are being taken.

MR. LONSDALE: Since when has the improvement occurred?

MR. BRYCE: The information has been conveyed to me in the last few days.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is it not the fact that whatever vestige of lawlessness remains is largely attributable to the fact that Lord Clanricarde and other landlords refuse to sell their properties? Will the Government, in the interest of the public peace of the county, take some steps to deal with such landlords?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a Question relating to policy of which notice should be given.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will put it down.

Return of Government Civil Servants in Ireland.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the Return ordered by Parliament last year regarding Government servants in Ireland; whether he can state if on June 6th of last year a circular signed by the Assistant Secretary, Mr. A. R. Barlas, was issued to the Local Government Board staff, intimating that the Board proposed to refuse to supply the information ordered by the House to be supplied in the column marked place of education; whether he is aware that the entry made in all cases in this column was, information not available, and that the refusal to supply the information to this House was the act of the heads of the Department, and not of the members of the staff; whether he can state if this circular was issued by the direction of the Vice-President of the Department; and whether the Government sanctions the conduct of permanent officials in Ireland inciting Government servants to refuse to supply particulars called for by the House.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed that the Question does not correctly state the facts. When Returns concerning the staff of the Local Government Board are required the Board usually supply the required information from the facts recorded in their office, without referring to the officials themselves. In the case, however, of the Return referred to, the information as to the place of education of the staff was not on record, and the draft Return containing all the information in the possession of the Board was therefore sent to each member of the staff for any corrections or additions he might think fit to make. The Vice-President informs me that there is no foundation for the suggestion that he incited members of the staff to refuse to supply the particulars called for by the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that when the circular asking for information ordered by this House was sent round one of the columns had already been filled up at headquarters with the words "Information not available?" Was not that done by the Board in Dublin, and does it not amount to a refusal to supply information ordered by this House?

MR. BRYCE: This occurred in the time of my predecessor, but I gather that the facts are not as represented by the hon. Member. The words were inserted because it was found that the officials were not bound to state their place of education, and did not desire to do it. That was the result of certain inquiries which had been made.

MR. MACVEAGH: Has the right hon. Gentleman been told by any official in the Local Government Board that the facts are as he has stated? Do they deny that they issued the circular with this column filled up in advance?

MR. BRYCE: That should be the subject of a separate Question.

MR. MACVEAGH: It is the Question on the Paper.

MR. BRYCE: Well, I do not think the hon. Member's interpretation of the circular is the correct one, as I gather from the information supplied to me. If the hon. Member wishes for further information he had better put down another Question.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman ask for a copy of the circular and judge for himself?

Mr. BRYCE: I am willing to ask for that or any other piece of information put specifically to me. It is impossible for me to have a minute knowledge of what happened more than a year ago in the time of my predecessors.

Action against Sergeant Dobson, Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it has been brought to the notice of the Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary that at the last June quarter sessions held at Enniskillen the administratrix of the late Mr. Gerard A. Bird, solicitor, brought an action for recovery of £30 against Sergeant George Dobson, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Enniskillen; and that Sergeant Dobson defended this action on the plea that he had paid the late Mr. Bird the said sum two months before his death; whether he is aware that, after an exhaustive hearing before the County Court Judge, Dobson was decreed for the amount and his evidence wholly discredited; and that the learned judge commented severely upon Dobson's conduct, which he characterised as amounting to wilful perjury; whether Dobson has appealed against this decision; and, seeing that this sergeant as a public officer has to bring charges against members of the community, whether his evidence will in future be admissible in the petty sessions or other Courts of Justice; and, if it is the intention of the Inspector-General to dispense with this policeman's services.

*Mr. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that the acts are generally as stated in the first part of the Question. A decree was given against Sergeant Dobson for the sum of £30 which he alleged he had paid, but for which he was unable to produce a receipt. The County Court Judge said that as the sergeant had no receipt he was obliged to give a decree, but I am informed that he did not animadvert on the sergeant's conduct, much less characterise his evidence as amounting to wilful perjury. The sergeant has not appealed. His superior officers state that he is a satisfactory policeman and that he has not forfeited the confidence of the people, and the Inspector-General does not intend to dispense with his services.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is it not the fact that the judge refused to believe the sworn evidence of this man?

*Mr. BRYCE: My information is that he said he must grant the decree because no receipt could be produced and he did not suggest perjury at all.

Commission on Land Congestion.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Commission to inquire into congestion in Ireland has yet held its preliminary sitting; when will the first public sitting be held, and where; and will he see that a sitting be held in Cavan.

*Mr. BRYCE: I understand that the Commission is holding its preliminary sitting to-day with the object of making arrangements as to its future sittings and procedure. It may be assumed that a public announcement on the subject will be made in due course. Any application which may be sent to the Secretary as to a sitting in a particular place or as to any other matter will be brought before the Commission.

Lord Southwell's Ballingrane Limerick Estate.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will see that the Estates Commissioners do not complete the sale of the estate of Lord Southwell at Ballingrane, in the county of Limerick, until all the evicted tenants on it be reinstated in their holdings.

*Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they will have due inquiries made into the cases of the evicted tenants before sanctioning the advances applied for in connection with the sale of the estate mentioned.

Arva Eviction.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Government to supply the forces of the Crown in the proposed eviction of Mulligan, of Arva, and in view of the effects of this operation, and the resentment which is already felt locally, will steps be taken to secure that the police are not quartered on the residents of Arva, who do not seek to aid in any way in this eviction, and whose small houses are already unable to comfortably accommodate their present occupants.

*MR. BRYCE : The hon. Member must be aware that the Sheriff is legally entitled to receive protection from the forces of the Crown in the execution of decrees of the courts. If it should be necessary to bring an extra force of police into Arva in connection with the case referred to, all possible consideration will be given to the convenience of the inhabitants. The police are not billeted upon the residents, but are located in a temporary barrack or, if necessary, in lodgings voluntarily afforded by the inhabitants.

Magistrates' Appointment Fees.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.) : I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he will consider the advisability of abolishing the judicature stamp duty of £6 now payable by a magistrate in Ireland on his appointment to the Commission of the Peace, and adopting for Ireland the scale of fees at present obtaining in England.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) : The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that the Attorney-General has any power to change the fee payable on the appointment of a magistrate. The present fee of £6 was fixed by an Order made under Statute in 1877 by the then Lord-Chancellor and the Presidents of the Common Law Divisions with the concurrence of the Treasury. The practice in Ireland differs from that which prevails in England. In Ireland each magistrate receives a separate commission which entails expense, and this is not the case in England. In England additional fees, varying in amount, are charged in respect of magistrates taking office, and these are not payable in Ireland. The Lord-Chancellor informs me that the matter requires some consideration, but that he is willing to consult the Chief Justice and the Chief Baron at the first opportunity in order to ascertain their views as to the possibility of reducing the fees, and I shall myself consult the Treasury on the subject.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) : Does not the charging of these fees debar working men becoming magistrates in Ireland ?

*MR. CHERRY : I am not in a position to say that there are no working men in Ireland who would be willing to pay £6 for the privilege.

Education of the Blind and the Deaf.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY : I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the necessity for legislation on the lines of the Elementary Education (Blind and Deaf Children) Act, 1893 ; in view of the successful operation of this Act, will he consider the whole question with a view to extending its provisions to Ireland ?

*MR. BRYCE : It appears to have escaped the hon. Member's notice that a Bill upon this subject has already been introduced by the Government and read a second time. If the hon. Member will refer to the Order Paper he will see that the Bill is down for the Committee to-day.

Cavan Postal Service.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will grant further postal facilities to the country people who reside in the townlands of Shannow, Derrin, Drumicanoe, Teduhan, Drumhilla, Mullaghaboy, Urble and Drumbruckles, and are at present so indifferently served by the postal arrangements at present provided in the Carrigan to Teduhan postal district, county Cavan ; will he bring the service up to the standard of the surrounding district ; and, if not, will he say what would be the extra working costs of the extended facilities asked for in this Question.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) : I have called for a report on this subject, and will send the hon. Member an answer in due course.

Rathkeale Post Office.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he has received a copy of the Resolution from the Town Tenants Association, at Rathkeale, protesting against the action of Mrs. Howard, the new postmistress at Rathkeale, in seeking to acquire the licensed premises there from which the representatives of the late James Carey were evicted; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General if he can say what has been the result of his inquiry into the fact that Mrs. Howard, the new postmistress at Rathkeale, has been negotiating with the landlord of the licensed premises from which the representatives of James Carey, deceased, were recently evicted for non-payment of one year's rent for the purpose of acquiring same for a post office; whether he is aware that James Carey effected improvements in these premises to the value of £500, and that Mrs. Howard's action has given rise to indignation amongst the people of the town; and whether, having regard to the fact that the representatives of deceased want to have a fair rent fixed for the premises, he will take steps to see that this postal official does not interfere in the matter.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have a telegram to the effect that Mrs. Howard does not propose to acquire the premises referred to.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Did she not propose to do it at one time?

[No Answer was returned.]

Roscrea Castles.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is a desire among the people of Roscrea for the preservation of the three old castles within the barracks; and whether these remains will be preserved by the Board of Works when the barracks are disposed of by the military authorities.

Mr. McKENNA: Under the Ancient Monuments Acts the Board of Works have power, on the request of the owner, to take over the guardianship of any ancient monument possessing historical, traditional, or artistic interest if, in their opinion, the preservation of such a monument is a matter of public interest; but I am informed no application has been made to the Board to take over the castles at Roscrea. The last sentence of the question refers to a hypothetical case, and I cannot state what action will be taken until the occasion arises.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): May I inform the hon. Member for Mid Armagh that the people of Roscrea are quite competent to manage their own affairs without his intervention?

North Sea Fishery Investigations.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the North Sea International Scientific Investigations have now sufficiently advanced to enable the Government to form an opinion as to the advisability of closing against foreign as well as British trawlers areas such as the Moray Firth.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): The investigations to which my hon. friend refers are still incomplete, and no conclusions as to the advantage of closing areas such as the Moray Firth can as yet be drawn from them. As my hon. friend is probably aware, further papers as to the work of the International Council which has been charged with these investigations have recently been presented to Parliament.

The Prime Minister and the Duma.

Lord TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government intend to use their good offices to assist the Russian Government in the formation of a new Duma.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not sure whether the noble Lord seriously intends this Question to be put and answered?

Lord TURNOUR: Yes, Sir.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I make no comment. The Answer is in the negative.

Lord TURNOUR: Arising out of that Answer, may I ask the right hon.

Gentleman whether he was merely expressing his own private views——

*MR. SPEAKER: If the noble Lord is going to ask the Prime Minister a Question in reference to a statement made out of doors, I think he ought to give notice of it. The matter does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

LORD TURNOUR: I shall put the Question down.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (No. 2) BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 326.]

CONVEYANCING BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time on Tuesday, 23rd October, and to be printed. [Bill 328.]

MARRIED WOMENS PROPERTY BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 23rd October, and to be printed. [Bill 329.]

SETTLED LAND BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 23rd October, and to be printed. [Bill 330.]

NEW BILLS.

RAILWAYS (CONTRACTS) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Railway and Canal Companies' Rates and Conditions of Conveyance," presented by Mr. Hooper; supported by Sir William Holland, Mr. Channing, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. J. W. Wilson, Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Dr. Hazel, and Mr. Hyde; to be read a seond time upon Wednesday, 24th October, and to be printed. [Bill 324.]

ARCHITECTS' REGISTRATION BILL.

"To provide for the Registration of Architects," presented by Mr. Atherley-Jones; supported by Sir George Fardell, Mr. Hamar Greenwood, Mr. Fenwick, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. John O'Connor and Mr. Wallace; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 325.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

As amended, further considered.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) moved an Amendment to Clause 4 providing that a local authority "shall" instead of "may" afford extended facilities for religious instruction of a special character in any transferred voluntary school in an urban area on application made and after holding a public local inquiry as to the wishes of the parents of four-fifths of the children. As the clause stood, he said, the local education authority must take many steps before it could discuss the question as to whether it should or should not allow these extended facilities. If a certain number of parents applied to the local authority for extended facilities the authority was bound to act upon the application. In such a case there was not question of "may" or "shall"; the local authority must take the steps set forth in the section. Amendments had been put down in the name of the Minister for Education making quite clear what was not clear before as to the order in which things were to be done. There were many other points in the clause to which they might call attention by Amendments before the debate was brought to a forced conclusion, but this word "may" stood in the foreground. As he had said, the local authority must take steps upon receipt of an application from parents for extended facilities. There were certain things which must be done even before these extended facilities were applied for. For instance, owners must be willing to allow the use of their schools for such extended facilities. But at any rate the local authority must, on application, forthwith hold a ballot and also an inquiry. If the result of the ballot was satisfactory and showed that there was a demand, and that the demand was genuine and the inquiry showed that there was accommodation for those who did not desire these facilities, then surely the matter should not be left to the discretion of the local authority to say whether or not the facilities should be granted? There could be no doubt that among many local authorities there would be differences of opinion, and in the electorate, which returned the members of local authorities, there would also be differences of opinion. Yet in spite of this it was proposed to leave the matter to the discretion—it might be to the pure caprice of the local authority, and he was sure that a very bitter and troublesome topic would thereby be introduced into municipal elections. It must be borne in mind that it was not a question which they could settle at once and for ever when the Bill was in operation. New schools might be handed over to the local authority and a similar demand made which would necessitate the taking of similar steps. The ballot and the local inquiry would have to be again held and the authority would have to use its discretion. Again, schools might alter their character; the population might shift, and transferred voluntary schools with facilities under Clause 3 might reasonably wish to become candidates for facilities under Clause 4. Then again, they would have the long course of procedure, and the local authority would be invited to state whether they would grant the facilities when they had already satisfied themselves upon the point. It might be that they would exercise their discretion not in deference to the wishes of the parents, but in deference to the religious prejudices of certain members of the council or a certain portion of the electorate. It was wholly unreasonable to require the local authority to take these elaborate steps if they were going in the end to leave the outcome to the discretion of that authority. He did not wish to detain the House long on this matter which had been dealt with once, but which must be dealt with again if they were to do their duty by the voluntary schools. The clause as it stood, while imposing some rigid requirements on the local authorities, left them at the end a discretion which might do a positive injustice alike to the authorities and to voluntary schools, which might be refused the extended facilities. He moved.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he desired to second the Amendment. He deeply regretted the restrictions of this clause. The clause really consisted of a number of valueless obstacles, and in its present condition was in his judgment prejudicial to the cause of education. The facilities supposed to be given under it were given with severe restrictions and ponderous obstacles. He objected to any language in the clause which gave option or discretion to the local authorities. The freedom which some of them desired for denominational education ought not to be restricted in this way. He had a great respect for the judgment of local authorities in many regards, but in the West Riding they had had an example to their disappointment and regret of a feeling which he thought unworthy of the great cause of education and which they did not expect from a great authority such as that in the West Riding. He objected to the creation of new difficulties and fresh impediments. Their work as educationists was difficult enough; the labours were severe enough; and in many respects the expenses were heavy enough. Why then add these laborious difficulties and expenses by such provisions as were in the Bill? The creation of these State-aided schools was insufficient and inadequate, and he was afraid the schools would not be in the forefront of educational reform, or be worthy of the duties which would devolve upon them. The difficulties would be abundant at every stage. They had first of all uncertainty. In education perhaps more than any other department they wanted, certainty, accuracy, and permanence. Under this clause they got none of those things. They were involved in elections. Many had complained of the elections attendant on the school boards, and one reason why many were agreed on the subject of the abolition of the school boards was that it did away with vexatious elections and with all the uncertainty. This clause would result in the election of a new group, and would create a new series of difficulties and some of those entanglements connected with electioneering which were a necessary part of our representative system. Then there was a great deal of time taken up, and properly taken up, by prolonged investigation, after which there was the overwhelming difficulty of bringing the reluctant voters to the poll. Many of the parents affected by this clause would by the nature of their occupations be at a distance from the schools, and there would be great difficulty in getting them to vote. The clause would inflict great injustice and unnecessary labour and trouble on the friends of education, and it was because his earnest desire was to promote the cause of education that he seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 7 to leave out the word 'may,' and insert the word 'shall'."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'may' stand part of the Bill.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said it had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland that this clause had been put in to get rid of the opposition of the Catholics, and he supposed the Government were of the same opinion. Without the word "shall" it would be of no use to the Catholics of England, because it left the question in a state of uncertainty and placed the Catholics at the mercy of the local authorities. Even if the word "shall" was substituted for "may" the Catholics would still be very badly off, because there were more than 200 schools which would not come under this clause.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he had voted for this Amendment in Committee and should do so now, for the reason, among others, that since he had voted before, an opportunity had been given for schools to contract out. As the matter stood, with regard to the extended facilities, the Bill provided that they should be given if demanded through the ballot by the parents of four-sixths of the children. Then the facilities might be withdrawn if it were found after a local inquiry that the conditions were not maintained under which the original demand was acquiesced in. In the face of these facts no one could imagine a local authority which could not be compelled to afford those facilities. What he foresaw was that there would be on the local authorities some bigoted people who would give some trouble, and upon that ground alone he should vote for the clause being made mandatory. He viewed it from the point of view that if it were made mandatory it would take this matter of high controversy out of the hands of the local authority. He was inclined to think that the Board of Education would give all that was necessary. But if the denominational schools did not think so, and as the acceptance of this Amendment did not affect any principle, and as it was pressed with so much insistence, he did not see why the right hon. Gentleman could not accept it.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said that in the interests of the local authorities it was desirable to make this clause mandatory. The Irish Party were in favour of the Amendment and would vote accordingly.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said if this clause were made mandatory the local authority would become a mere registration agent. He considered that it would be a good thing to have discussion at election time in regard to these education questions. He did not agree with the idea that the local authority was always going to be managed by one or two bigoted people who would pervert the other members. His experience of local authorities was that they were not bigoted, but that they would be made so if there was an attempt to drive them by superior authority. As a matter of high principle the local authorities should be left with some liberty of action, so that they might have the honour, glory, and credit of doing right sometimes. When the local authorities were so managed by Government Departments that they could have no option to go wrong and therefore no credit for going right it would be a bad day for local government.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) ventured to hope against hope that his right hon. friend would accept the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University. He agreed with the hon. Member for Sleaford in thinking that a question of principle was here involved. He did not approach this question quite from the same point of view as the hon. Member for Oxford University or the hon. Member for Wigan. He considered that this Bill was just and impartial between all Protestant Churches. But while he regarded the third clause of this Bill as wholly inconsistent with its first principle and not to be reconciled with it by any application or mis-application of human ingenuity, he considered the 4th clause to be frankly and avowedly an exception to the general principle of the Bill. The general principle of the Bill was that schools supported or aided by the taxes or the rates were to be undenominational. That principle was clearly put before the electors and decided without doubt, but he thought this was just an instance to show that it was impossible for this House to legislate without the application of the common sense and judgment of individual Members, because it was an instance where a general rule required a particular exception in a very prominent and very notorious case. It was quite clear that if they were to apply that general principle to the Roman Catholic schools of the country it would be equivalent to closing them altogether, and he did not believe there was a man in the House who would contemplate such a possibility with an even mind. He ventured to support a similar Amendment to this in Committee, and he received in consequence a friendly remonstrance from a constituent and supporter who accused him of upholding priestly intolerance. He did not feel very much priest-ridden. A priest who rode him would have to ride with a snaffle, and then he was afraid he would jib. But all intolerance was not priestly, and there was a class of man upon whom the sight or the idea of a priest produced an effect which did not tend to tolerance, and did not deserve that name. The Established Church was not entitled to complain of a State religion which Parliament might consider suitable for children in elementary schools, so long as the Established Church was not entitled to the same liberty as the Free Churches But the Church of Rome in this country was in a different position. It owed nothing to the State and the State was nor morally entitled to interfere in any way with the conduct of its schools any more than with that of its churches. The only point on which he should differ from the arguments so ably and persuasively urged by hon. Gentlemen from Ireland on behalf of the great Church for which they spoke and to which most of them belonged was that he did not think they had quite enough confidence in the good sense, fairness, and justice of the local representative bodies of this country. Much as he would deplore the rejection of this Amendment he did not believe it would have half the practical effect hon. Gentlemen from Ireland apprehended, even if it had any practical effect at all. They in this House lived perhaps a little too much in a Party atmosphere. They all were party men, except Mr. Speaker, and it was a false analogy to assume that local representative bodies were constituted in a similar way or guided by similar principles. Questions in an administrative body did not naturally assume a Party form. The Party system had no more eloquent defender than the Leader of the Opposition, and he agreed with every word the right hon. Gentleman had said upon the subject. He believed it to be natural and essential and the most wholesome method of fighting out public questions in Parliament and on the platform. But it did not extend to local administrative bodies where differences arose on matters not of principle or Party, but of application, of judgment, and of common sense. Though he voted for this Amendment and should vote for it again, he had so much confidence in the justice, fairness, equity, and good sense of his fellow-countrymen assembled for administrative purposes that he did not believe the rejection of the Amendment and the adoption of the clause in the form it now appeared would do any substantial injustice.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he had listened, as he always did listen, to the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down with considerable interest, but there was one part of his speech which he heard not merely with interest, but with profound astonishment, and he should be glad to know, in the course of the debate, how far the views the hon. Gentleman expressed found an echo on the Treasury Bench or on the Benches behind. The hon. Gentleman had frankly told the House that so far as the Church of England and the Wesleyans were concerned he thought this clause totally unnecessary, and that he regarded it as a clause entirely designed for the relief of Roman Catholics, for which reason he thought it ought to have a place in the Bill. The hon. Gentleman was not content with that statement, but had gone with some elaboration into the reasons why the House should consider the consciences of the Catholics but should not consider the consciences of members of the Church of England. The speech of the hon. Member was remarkable and interesting because it admitted what was undoubtedly the fact, that Parliament was imposing by this Bill a State religion upon the elementary schools of the country. It certainly came with a shock to him to learn that it was the accepted doctrine of the Liberal Party that it was the business this House to impose a religion upon the children of the country.

MR. PAUL: Only the Christian religion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Christians of this country had rights of conscience as against Mahomedans and Buddhists but not as against other Christians who might happen to differ from them. That was an amazing doctrine to hear from any quarter of the House, but to hear it from a gentleman who was admitted to be an able, learned, and cultivated exponent of Liberalism was really one of the most astonishing statements he remembered to have heard in his Parliamentary life. The hon. Gentleman had said the Church of England had no rights in this matter because it was a State Church; the Roman Catholics had rights because Roman Catholicism was not a State Church. The hon. Member had gone the length of saying that while the Church of England, and Church of England schools, had no rights in this regard, there was not a man in the House who would not regard it as a monstrous thing that the schools of the Roman Catholics should be interfered with—that it was contrary to morality, to justice, to all sense of right. It was a violation of all their views of what was right that the Roman Catholic schools should be interfered with; it was not a violation that Anglican schools should be interfered with, and that simply because the Roman Catholic religion did not happen to be established, and the Anglican religion did happen to be established. Supposing the Church of England were disestablished to-morrow? Would their rights of conscience revive? Would they again be able to count themselves among those whose religious convictions had to be considered by this House? Would they regain their equitable position amongst citizens? Would they cease to be pariahs, the natural victims of any majority which chose to attack them? This was an amazing proposition, and if it was really held by hon. Gentlemen opposite they ought at all events to keep the Church of England schools in a position of suspended animation so that, if the Liberation Society had their way and the Church of England was disestablished she might again enter into her rights, and not be put as far below the Roman Catholics as the hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton now put her. He would be glad to know, because this was an important point, how far the Government echoed the view of the hon. Gentleman. He concurred with the hon. Member in thinking that there was something more than a question of procedure behind the alteration of the word "may" into "shall." The hon. Member for North Camberwell had supported the Amendment chiefly on administrative grounds, but there was something more here than a question of procedure. There was a question of policy, and he really wanted to know what the Government's policy was upon the matter. He believed it was that, in every instance where there was a case made out under the provisions of the section for special facilities, there special facilities should be given. The Government view was that if four-fifths of the parents desired special facilities, and if there was alternative accommodation and the school was situated in an area with a population of 5,000, then facilities should be granted. The Government had put their clause in the permissive form, but he did not believe their object was permissive. When the local authorities found the word "may" they would say Parliament intended that, whatever the position of the school and the attendant conditions, there should be a certain amount of discretion exercised by the local educational authority. The Government ought to make this point perfectly plain on the face of the clause. How did it affect the denominations? The fact that all denominations were prepared to vote for this Amendment was perhaps sufficient justification for his saying that they all desired it, and it was obvious that they desired it, because it put their case in a clear way. His hon. friend who moved the Amendment had made it clear to all who listened to his speech that the clause, as at present drawn, might inflict the greatest hardship upon the local authority, because, whatever its views, it would be obliged to go through a long series of Parliamentary operations which, if it did not mean to grant facilities, would be abortive and only calculated to excite excessive bitterness within that particular area. What was the position? If an application was made to a local authority they had to institute a ballot, hold a local inquiry, and make an elaborate examination of the parents who were not able to vote at the time the ballot was taken. They had to consider most complicated questions with regard to alternative accommodation. They had to consider all those points, whether they liked it or not, although they might all the time be of opinion that whatever the result might be they did not intend to grant facilities. Was that a tolerable position to put a local authority in, or a position in which a school and the inhabitants of a parish ought to be put. Let them consider the soreness and bitterness that would arise if, after it had been clearly established that the conditions laid down had been adequately fulfilled, extended facilities were refused by the local authority. The feelings of any denomination subjected to such treatment would be bitter in the extreme. The President of the Board of Education had complained that this Bill was going to throw upon himself and his Department and his successors a very heavy burden. All sorts of difficult problems were under the Bill reserved for the determination of the Board of Education. What he desired to point out was that if they kept the clause as it was now worded every local authority would consider that Parliament intended it to exercise a discretion because the words were "The local authority may." The result of that would be that the local authority would say "Parliament intended us, whatever the decision of the parents might be or however ample the accommodation, to exercise a discretion in the matter, and we will exercise it." They might institute a ballot and hold an elaborate inquiry, and still be determined to exercise the discretion that Parliament in their view intended they should exercise. Schools might then be unfairly treated and the Board of Education would be in very great difficulty from the institution of this additional category of schools. With the insertion of the word "shall" every educational authority would know that if the conditions were fulfilled it was the intention of Parliament that facilities should be granted. That was the intention of the Government, and why should they not let it manifestly appear as the intention of Parliament? Why should they give opportunity for increasing the number of cases that might end in controversy between local authorities and the Board of Education? Why should the Government bring upon themselves a large number of difficult problems which they might easily avoid, and which they would be hard put to to settle? He gathered from the right hon. Gentleman that he had not the machinery at his disposal for coercing the local authorities, and he appeared to think that the number of local authorities who would not obey what the whole House regarded as the intention of the clause would be few. He himself did not think so. He believed that if the House said explicitly that under Clause 4 it was the intention of Parliament, when the conditions were fulfilled, such facilities should be granted, the local authorities who would refuse to carry out that intention would not be at all considerable. The Government would have ample machinery for dealing with those who refused; they would have behind them the whole feeling of the country; they would have behind them the great mass of the feeling within the area of the local authority itself, and he thought they might without fear undertake the task of making the local authorities do their duty. He very earnestly pressed the Government in the interest of the denominations, of localities, and of the Educational Department, to make clear, on the face of the clause, what they had always declared was their intention.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he was not concerned to defend his hon. friend the Member for Northampton from the searching criticisms of the Leader of the Opposition, because his hon. friend had reminded him that he was a party man and at the same time had announced his intention of voting against the Government. He was therefore relieved of all obligation in the matter and would leave his hon. friend to his own resources, and did so the more rapidly because nature and art had amply provided his hon. friend's armoury with weapons of defence and offence. Whatever parts of the Bill—and he did not deny that there were such—had not received their full meed of Parliamentary discussion, that could not be said of the point before the House, for they had rung the changes upon "may" and "shall" through many pages of *Hansard.* He had read a very long speech he delivered on June 26th, dealing with the very point the right hon. Gentleman had put so clearly. He asked the House to remember that the Bill as originally introduced when this point was raised did not contain an appeal to the Board of Education. The Government gave the matter careful consideration and came to the conclusion that, on the whole, their wish and desire—which had been accurately expressed by the right hon. Gentleman, that where the conditions existed facilities should be granted by a local authority—would be more likely to be carried out by adopting the Amendment giving an appeal to the Board of Education than by relying on a *mandamus,* a weapon of the law to be used in the last resort. They could not stroll into a Court and get a *mandamus* for the asking; they had to show a clean-cut issue, and the particular point upon which a local authority had failed to discharge a very clear duty. There were the preliminary conditions. The result of a ballot could, of course, be ascertained, but the question of accommodation could not nearly so well be determined by the Court of King's Bench as by a Department which knew all the facts through its own inspectors and the general merits of the whole matter even before the question arose for decision. These were the reasons he put before the Committee as grounds for adopting the clause which now had a place in the Bill, for proceeding by an appeal to the Board of Education rather than by *mandamus.* Of course the right hon. Gentleman had put forward a point of view for which a great deal could be said as matter of speculation. It was matter of speculation as to what was the more likely to mollify the stony hearts of local authorities. The right hon. Gentleman thought it was better that they should be told they had got to do this, but, on the other hand, he was inclined to think that exacerbation and bigotry would be avoided by adopting the course proposed in the Bill, which was almost compulsory, but not quite. The duty was imposed first of all—the preliminary duty—of taking a ballot and holding inquiry, and the facts being made public, and the conditions being shown to be satisfied, it was almost impossible to suppose that a local authority would refuse facilities. If it did refuse, then there was an appeal to the Board of Education. It was true he had complained, and did so still, in a way, although it might be said that he was largely the author of his own misfortunes, of the heavy duties that would be cast on the Board of Education; but this particular duty ought not to add greatly to those duties, for it dealt with a matter upon which the Board had knowledge peculiar to itself, and it would be far easier for the Department than for a Court of law to deal with it. He venture to differ from the right hon. Gentleman as to the effect of the clause as it stood upon the minds and wills of local authorities. There would be very few, he hoped, who would have any desire to withhold from a school which had run the gauntlet of these very severe conditions—and very severe they were—the facilities asked for, but if such a difficulty should arise he believed the Board of Education would find means and machinery to bring about a satisfactory solution. The situation was very much altered from what it was when the Bill was originally printed. The Government felt that the clause did require to be strengthened, and it had been strengthened in a most material manner, more so than it would be by substituting "shall" for "may," for they would have to give effect to "shall" if they inserted it, and he doubted very much if the weapon of the law would be likely to have as much influence as the Board of Education, who, being in touch with all the local authorities, knew the tempers, characters, and dispositions of almost all the leading educationists who were members of the various authorities, and could exercise a proper amount of friendly pressure such as a Court of law could not if it would and would not if it could. He could not accept the Amendment, believing that the clause as it stood would be more likely to effect the object of the Government—that when the conditions were fulfilled the facilities should follow.

*MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said that he had always thought the clause was an extremely bad one and it was unpopular with Nonconformists throughout the country.

MR. BIRRELL: No, no.

*MR. PERKS repeated that it was. His right hon. friend was at the present moment living in a state of absolute, intense darkness as to the feeling of Nonconformists on this subject.

MR. BIRRELL: I get a good many letters from your own body on the subject.

*MR. PERKS said that his right hon. friend was venturing on extremely dangerous and treacherous ground in regard to what he called, somewhat contemptuously, the Methodist body.

MR. BIRRELL: I said your own body.

MR PERKS said they were generally known as the Wesleyan Methodist Church. He would pass that by, however, and prove that the right hon. Gentleman was totally ignorant of the views of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in this country. Might he say, in passing, that the Leader of the Opposition, when he referred to the desires of the denominations, had no right to include in that term the Wesleyan Methodist denomination? He was as much in error in claiming to speak for the Wesleyan Methodist Church as was his right hon. friend below him in fancying that he was supported by the Wesleyan Methodist Church on this particular clause. Last week they had had an enormous conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Nottingham, attended by nearly 600 delegates chosen from all parts of England. A resolution was submitted blessing the right hon. Gentleman's Bill, calling it a wise and statesmanlike measure—the common form often indulged in by his hon. friend the Member for Northampton. This resolution finished by calling upon the whole of the Wesleyan Methodist Church to support the Government in this matter, but one of the leading members of the Methodist Church—one of its most trusted ex-Presidents—rose and moved an Amendment, which was adopted by the overwhelming majority of 480 to thirty, eliminating all the laudatory expressions—the common form—and simply falling back on a general expression of approval of the Bill in so far as it met the views of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. Both the original resolution and the amendment directly and emphatically condemned this particular clause. They agreed with the right hon. Gentleman so far; but they said that this was a bad clause and would not suit them. That was also his answer to the Leader of the Opposition when he claimed to represent the Wesleyan Methodist Church as in favour of the compulsory character of this clause. He was going to vote for the clause being permissive because it reserved to the local authorities this faint, shadowy, misty modicum of power which they thought they had before in a higher degree. He had always suspected that the measure was intended to be mandatory, but that the Government had not the hardihood to say so. Now they said that they had come as near as they dared to making the clause compulsory. Any lawyer familiar with the Courts must have suspected that there were lurking behind this clause various provisions which would involve the local authorities in compulsion to put this clause in operation. But his right hon. friend said he regarded himself as the protector of the clause and, he thought, of the denominations.

Mr. BIRRELL: I said "protector of the clause."

Mr. PERKS: Protector of the clause; but who were the people to be protected by the clause? They were the denominations *minus* the Wesleyan Methodists—the Roman Catholics, the Jews, and all the other denominations who chose to claim the benefit of the clause. He remembered that when the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University was at the Education Department they were familiar with cartoons representing ecclesiastics in various garbs climbing up the backstairs of the Education Department to exercise various species of terrorism upon him. His right hon. friend might not always be at the Education Department; it was conceivable that this Government might not always be in power. What was to happen when a Board of Education altogether out of sympathy with Liberalism, out of sympathy especially with Nonconformity, was installed in Whitehall to operate this clause as the special protector of the denominational schools of the country? His Church which ranked in numbers next to the Church of England, were almost unanimously against this clause. His right hon. friend shook his head; but it was possible that if the right hon. Gentleman showed him the letters he had received and their signatures he would be able to detect the cause of their sympathetic messages. They would possibly be found to come from Conservative Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. [An Hon. Member: Why not?] It was quite right for Wesleyans to be occasionally Conservative. There was, he thought, one in a former Parliament and one in the present, while there were twenty or thirty or more on the Liberal side. But his right hon. friend was utterly wrong in imagining that the Wesleyan Methodist Church were in favour of the clause, for they were against it almost to a man, believing that it perpetuated the denominational system in this country. They did not believe it would be as little operative as the right hon. Gentleman thought, but were strongly of opinion that it would at once be put in operation in scores of towns where the schools would in consequence become strictly sectarian, where the teachers would have to give sectarian teaching, while the schools would avail themselves of the full financial benefits of the Act. Although holding the clause to be a very bad clause indeed, repulsive to and unpopular with Nonconformists, he supported the Government because he believed the clause would be made still worse if it were made mandatory instead of permissive.

Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said that the amusing and candid speech which the House had just heard entirely justified the Amendment. The hon. Member had said—a sort of information which nobody could dispute—that this clause was repulsive to, and unpopular with, the body to which he belonged; and manifestly it would be unpopular with some local authorities. His right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition was quite correct when he said that if a discretion instead of a mandate were given to the local authority it would be in the highest degree irritating and costly, because the local authority would have to embark on an expensive inquiry and a ballot—all involving controversies, while it would lay a great burden on the Education Department. The Minister for Education regarded himself as the protector of this clause; but it came to this: that the right hon. Gentleman thought that the discretionary power given to the local authority, with a power of appeal to the Education Department, was more effective than *mandamus*. With great respect to the right hon. Gentleman, he thought that that argument was most fallacious. If after public inquiry the fact unquestionably came out that the four-fifths majority was genuine and that there was other accommodation in the district, it was manifest that the local authority would be unreasonable in not affording the facilities under Clause 4. The local authorities who would deny facilities would be those who were absolutely and conscientiously convinced that they ought not to be granted, and what was the use of merely exposing them to the blandishments of the Minister for Education under the Education Bill? The right hon. Gentleman said—"We shall be able to deal with them in a way in which they will listen to us, and we shall deal with them more effectually than the Court of King's Bench." But the hypothesis was that no local authority would refuse to carry out these proposals unless it was either contumacious and recalcitrant, or unless the members were thoroughly conscientious in their objection. In both those cases the persuasion of the Minister for Education would go for nothing and they would have to go to the Law Courts and get the pressure of a *mandamus* in order to make them fulfil the order made upon them by the Board of Education. Under the proposal which they were now pressing, however, the order would be made at a more convenient and at an earlier stage. The procedure under the clause would be this: There would be many complicated orders not obeyed and many duties which ought to be performed by the local authorities not carried out. The Department then went to the Court for a *mandamus* and the local authorities were ordered to perform their duties. Sometimes the local authority would make a return to the *mandamus* and say they had performed their duties, or under the circumstances they could not perform them. That was a very simple matter, and it would have the merit that in the remedy they were proposing it would come at an early stage before costs had been incurred or irritation set up. Hon. Members must see that in the event of a recalcitrant local authority refusing first to obey the counsel of the Government when they had declared their opinion, and then refusing to obey the mandate of four-fifths of the parents in their district, they would not hestiate to refuse to obey the order on appeal of the Board of Education. In that case the right hon. Gentleman's order would be only enforcible by *mandamus* and the Department would at a later stage be landed in litigation of that kind. This was what they were endeavouring to avoid.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) thought that the closely-reasoned argument of the right hon. Gentleman depended for its full effect on two suppositions neither of which could be admitted in discussing this clause. In the first place, it would surely be easier to carry out a specific order of the Board of Education than to obey a *mandamus* to enforce the word "shall," and he thought the right hon. Gentleman's arguments on that point would not commend themselves to the House. A more important matter in his judgment was the assumption that underlay the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman and of the Leader of the Opposition that there was nothing else to be thought about except the two provisos set out under the letters (a) and (b). There was another thing which they had not considered. Supposing there was this four-fifths majority, and there was accommodation for the other fifth elsewhere. Might it not be that in carrying out the clause if it read "shall" they would be perpetuating and stereotyping small schools and preventing proper arrangements for schools throughout a borough or an urban district? If they made the clause mandatory every school in a four-fifths area, provided it was healthy, would have to be carried on, with the result that a considerable number of parochial schools would be perpetuated, although most educationists would agree that the proper method of administration would be to have fewer and larger schools. If they left in the word "may," as he was glad to know the Government were prepared to do, they allowed these matters to be discussed between the local authorities and the Board of Education before a decision was arrived at. They would put the local authorities in the best position for bargaining with the owners of these schools. The local authority might say "We do not propose to take over St. Peter's school, but we are quite ready to enlarge All Saints' a quarter of a mile away so that the children can be accommodated." He most certainly hoped that the majority behind the Government, if the Amendment went to a division, would be a large one, because the amount of discretion left to local authorities—although it had been minimised in many speeches—was an amount which was absolutely necessary if the general educational benefits were not to be hampered by dealings with particular schools. Alterations had been made in the clause since it was before the Committee, and although the hon. Member for Louth had poured forth the vials of his mingled feelings with regard to the clause, the alterations had improved it. It was perfectly true that a number of Members who took the civic view did not like Clause 4 because it perpetuated that which in our national system would always be disliked up and down the country; but although the clause was disliked for these reasons he was perfectly certain that the alterations made by the Government would make it far more acceptable, both to those Nonconformists whose principles and views ran counter to it so acutely, and to those electors who took the civic view. It was very unfortunate that from many speakers they had heard language depreciatory of local authorities. Members who had served on local authorities knew that party spirit was much less acute on those bodies on this point and others than it was in regard to matters connected with national issues. It was desirable that the House should show more confidence in local authorities and not belittle them by suggesting that they were sure to be moved by sectarian feelings. He protested against such methods. He was quite certain that when the duties contained in the clause were placed on local authorities they would be thinking not how they could spite the Church people, or advance Nonconformist theories, but how they could carry out a difficult Act of Parliament in a way that would cause least friction in the areas for which they were responsible. If they deprived local authorities of all discretion they would be showing distrust to an extent which might bring about the very perils they were endeavouring to avoid. This little bit of discretion left to them would allow them to bring forward matters of educational moment in their areas. He was most anxious that all these considerations should be dealt with, and he thought that a final decision arrived at under such circumstances was likely to be acquiesced in much more cheerfully than if they altered the word "may" to "shall."

Mr. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.) said that every speech which he had heard in favour of the actionof the Government made him more convinced that those hon. Members were right who insisted upon fighting them upon the question of this clause being made mandatory. He would emphasise that view by referring to the speeches of the hon. Member for Louth and of the hon. Member for the Middleton Division. The hon. Member said that if they did not make the clause mandatory the local authority might, in carrying out the intentions of the Government, say, as a matter of bargain in a case where there was a four-fifths majority of parents, that although the people of St. Peter's might want denominational education they must go to All Saints' to get it. Then the hon. Gentleman contemplated the local authority adding rooms to All Saints' for the purpose of giving education to the children who came from St. Peter's. He thought it was unlikely, however, that the local authority would spend large sums of money upon buildings belonging to other people. Apart, however, from that, quite a different version had been given by the Minister for Education. They knew how strong a case could be made out educationally against the whole of this clause and the definitions under it. Any local authority could say, "Here are a number of small schools; we do not like small schools which are redundant, and not up-to-date, and the only justification for them is that four-fifths of the parents of the children attending them want the special religious instruction which these schools enable us to give." He thought everyone in the House would admit that it was a grotesque system which made denominational teaching depend upon buildings and property instead of giving the parents a right to say what they wanted. The result would be perpetual pressure between the educational need on the one hand and the denominational need on the other. They would, he thought, find that that pressure would lead to greater friction than was contemplated. The hon. Member for Louth in a good-tempered and interesting speech practically threw down the challenge to the Government which had been thrown every day outside. He had said that Nonconformists as a whole would not accept Clause 4. It was all very well to say that people would not oppose Clause 4, but in view of the fact that passive resistance was being threatened to that clause it was illusory for Members to say, "It's all right, there are only a few pig-headed people in the country; the local authorities can be trusted and things will come all right if we allow this complicated machinery to become operative." The hon. Member for the Middleton Division put the crown on the edifice when he suggested that it would bring greater interest into the elections. Had he known anything of the way in which it had killed all interest in London for the last six years and made us the laughing-stock of the civilised world he might have looked at the matter in a different light. However much it was wanted in Lincolnshire it was not wanted in London. He wished they could be quite certain that the Board of Education would as the last resource use compulsion; but why, if they wanted to do that, did they modify the whole Bill by allowing this hideous system of contracting out? He was quite sure the pressure of the ratepayer on the one hand and that of the local body, captured by a majority, pledged not to carry out the provisions of Clause 4, on the other, would prevent the compulsion which the hon. Member for St. George's anticipated. So long as there was a possibility of returning to the conditions that prevailed before 1902 they must use all the influence they could towards the only practical alternative and make the whole mandatory. Until he heard the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition he had never heard stated what appeared to be the heart of the question. Up to this moment it had been assumed that when they used the word "may" they were giving the local authorities a free choice. They said they were pig-headed if they did not take the action suggested. A perfectly different condition would be presented if the clause were made mandatory, because then they said the local authority "shall" do it and if they did not they broke the law. If they liked to break the law on religious grounds it would not be the first time it had been done, and he supposed the usual method would have to be applied. In the other case they approached the matter with an open mind; and it was a perfectly legitimate and arguable proposition to say that under certain circumstances they should not do it. Out of respect to the local authority they were to keep this hammer of the Board of Education over them which said they had a free choice but must not exercise it. That, in his opinion, was more insulting to the local authority than to make the clause frankly mandatory. It was said there would be no religious controversies on the local authorities, but religion had been largely dragged in through the municipal activity in education. Those who knew what preparations were going on in certain parts of England for the municipal elections with a view to this Bill must have seen that, if the clause passed in its present form, we should not have the same local authorities to deal with as we had to-day. The passing of this clause would change the character of the local authorities, and shut out those things which had united the churches on the side of pure government and divide them on this question of whether Clause 4 should be put into operation or not. So long as they did that, the Government were casting a bone of contention into the municipal life of England which might redound little to the credit of the work they were now engaged upon. He had no hope of inducing the President of the Board of Education to alter his decision, but he desired to enter a protest at the last moment against that decision.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said this clause appeared to him to be the most vital part of the Bill and the Amendment of his hon. friend the one thing that would help to give real vitality to it. He set no store on the facilities given under Clause 3, because it would be very difficult to obtain them, and if they were obtained it would be almost impossible to keep order in the schools. If by any chance order was kept, they would rob the head teacher of his chief influence, the influence conferred upon him by the religious teaching. This clause was the sheet anchor of both the children and the parents. Might not the clause be read thus: "The local authority may, if they think fit, allow four-fifths of the children to receive religous instruction which the parents wish, provided the parents express that wish through the ballot"? Or might it not be read in this way: "The local authority may, if they think fit, stand between the parents and their rights of conscience and their just authority"? If the Bill passed in its present form there could be nothing else but active and passive resistance. He could not say whether among those who thought they derived their authority, their rights of conscience, from a higher authority than the local authority, resistance might not become a duty. The local authority was notoriously chosen for other purposes, yet the Government delivered into their hands absolutely the consciences of the people in their areas. That seemed to him a very selfish arrangement. One area might recognise the rights of conscience of the parents and a contiguous area might confiscate those rights. They might almost have a parti-coloured map brought out by Mr. Stanford showing in red the areas where the rights of conscience were recognised and in blue those in which they were disallowed. Local authorities had been in the past and would in the future be elected on a party basis, and it must be remembered that a man of strong will on a small local authority could defeat one policy and carry out a new one. He thought they were delegating what was essentially a national duty to a local authority, and such a thing in his opinion could but cause resistance, and suggest to individuals that they should defend the rights which they considered most sacred against the local authority.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said that the basis on which the ballot under Clause 4 was to be taken was so gratuitously uncertain and shifting that it was well to leave the local authority with some discretion which would give them the chance of correcting the worst results of this uncertainty. The uncertainty was that they depended not on four-fifths of the parents but on the parents of four-fifths of the children. That left the matter in extreme uncertainty. A parent might have five children at school before the summer holidays and only two or three afterwards. A parent might come from a neighbouring village with three or four children, all of whom he wished to send to this school, and subsection 7 had introduced the extraordinary provision that the parent whose children had been to the school was to out-vote the parent whose children were going to the school, because no children would count unless they had been at the school six months. What was wanted to be known, he thought, in regard to religious facilities was the feeling among the parents and not the feeling among the children, and he could not understand why this uncertainty had been introduced in regard to the denominational character of a school, which, of all things dealt with in this measure, demanded permanence and stability in its treatment. For the first time in English constitutional history the value of a vote was to depend on the number of children a parent had at a particular place, at a particular time, and this was to rule the result of another startling innovation, a denominational ballot, in itself from many points of view a most objectionable arrangement. That being so, it was most important that the local authority should have a discretion so as to be able to over-rule, as it were, the ballot in cases where there was the confusion and mischief that would result from this clause as it now stood. Everyone who knew how local authorities handled these subjects would be thoroughly ready to give them the discretion which was embodied in this clause.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said in view of many speeches which had been delivered by the supporters of the Government during the debate he thought it not unnecessary to explain that he did not rise as a critic of the Government. He believed that their decision not to make the clause mandatory was thoroughly wise and statesmanlike. He thought it desirable in the interests of the local authorities that some discretion should be left to them in this matter. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had argued for the Amendment, because he was afraid of the introduction of religious differences into local elections. He did not see, however, why the introduction of religion should necessarily embitter election controversies. He knew that men who differed on religious matters contended more fiercely than on other subjects, the reason no doubt being that each one thought his opponent not only intellectually wrong, but wicked, and that he was therefore justified in denouncing him more fiercely. He could not think, however, that it would be a bad thing from the point of view of local elections if wider interests were introduced into them, and he did not share the fear that the discussion of the subject of religious teaching at council meetings would necessarily have a bad effect upon the elections. It was exceedingly undesirable to multiply opportunities of over-ruling local authorities. They could not do a worse injury to the local government of the country than to cause a central authority to interfere continually with local administration. It was bad for the work of the local authorities that they should be frequently over-ruled. He did not think the clause as it stood would provide many opportunities for disputes between the central and the local authorities. It was more likely to do so if the clause were made mandatory, because local authorities might put their backs to the wall, as had happened before, and might refuse to do as they were told. If the question were left to the good sense of the local authorities, and to the arguments of the Board of Education, friction would be minimised to the greatest possible extent. Moreover, they could not in the long run beat the local authority if it came to a fight. The local authority was on its own ground, and was supported by local opinion, or it would not set itself up against the decision of the central authority. The late Government knew what it was to have the local authorities in Wales solid against their views on an education question. The local authorities in Wales, supported by the Welsh voters, were too many for the Education Department in the long run. The hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University shook his head, but he (Mr. Leif Jones) thought they had triumphed. Therefore the course of wisdom was that chosen by the Government in this matter. They had left a comparatively free hand to the local authorities, but they had retained the power to step in if the local authorities acted unwisely; and, by providing a safety valve in the shape of State-aided schools outside the general system, he thought the Government had shown practical commonsense. He therefore gave the Government proposal his hearty support.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes 160. (Division List No. 261.).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Chas. P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Parlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. W. (Devonport
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight

Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Palmer, Sir Charles Mark
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, Jas. (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L (Leeds, S.)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hud'rs'field
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (City Lond

Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chance, Frederick William
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Harwood, George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hogan, Michael
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Masterman, C. F. G
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wardle, George J.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

MR. EVELYN CECIL moved to omit from line 10 the words "in an urban area." It appeared to him that the Government had absolutely made up their mind not to accept anything in the shape of Amendments, and however good the arguments might be they obstinately declined to make any concession. When this Amendment was discussed in Committee the arguments against it were of such a feeble character that he thought there should be an opportunity of reconsidering the question. The Secretary to the Board of Education, in declining to accept this Amendment, said that the ballot would be an inconvenient procedure to work in the country. In other words, it meant that the country districts were too stupid to understand the ballot. If this argument was applied to Parliamentary elections where would they be? They did not hear any suggestion that the ballot should not operate at Parliamentary elections, and why should the ballot not take place under this clause? It was most astonishing that the hon. Member opposite should have brought forward such a reason for not omitting these words. The reason given by the President of the Board of Education was that the Government were bound to make a distinction between a town and country atmosphere, but if hon. Members would go into the merits of the case it was perfectly impossible to find any reason for that argument. There was no difference between a town and country atmosphere in this matter, and what they desired was that full justice should be done to those who desired denominational teaching. Was the soul of the town child more precious than that of the country child? To bring forward arguments of such a flimsy character as those they had heard from the Treasury Bench seemed to him to be trifling with the House. All the arguments were on the side of adopting this Amendment, and the Return recently issued as to the effect of this Amendment in regard to the various denominations was very conclusive. An urban area was defined as one with a population of 5,000 or more. In the case of the Jews they would not suffer at all by this limitation; but only 77 per cent. of the Roman Catholic schools would come under the section, and in the case of the Church of England only 25 per cent. Was that fair? Was that justice? Supposing this population of 5,000 in any particular district for some reason connected with trade or otherwise became diminished, what was to happen? Was it suggested that having got facilities under this clause they were to be deprived of them merely because of the mechanical reason that the population had fallen below 5,000? Why did the Government persist in refusing this Amendment? The clause referred to "any transferred voluntary school in an urban area." So that unless the school was a transferred voluntary school in an urban area the clause did not apply. Why should they make that difference? There was no answer to that question; it was perfectly unanswerable. In order that this clause should come into effect it would be necessary to look into the history of the school to ascertain whether it was a transferred voluntary school or not. If it was, it would get this teaching, but otherwise it would be forbidden all the privileges under this clause. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to bring any adequate argument against it. What struck him very much in the debate in Committee on this matter was that the simple expedient of omitting the words was given the go-by by the Government, though a number on their own side, including the hon. Member for the Leek Division and the hon. Member for Barnsley pointed out that there were certain schools in their own constituencies which deserved special consideration in connection with this clause. Their speeches showed that there were somewhat awkward qualms of conscience felt by some hon. Members on the Government side of the House. If the Amendment were not accepted substantial injustice would be done in their own constituencies, and that gave them courage to give voice to that feeling in the House. If this Bill was to be adjusted to treat all concerned fairly—and that had been the argument of the Government, however feebly it might have been carried out in the Bill—he strongly urged that this distinction between the urban and the rural areas ought not to be made. He hoped the President of the Board of Education would accept the Amendment, and thereby introduce a simpler and far juster scheme.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan), in seconding the Motion, said that this was a subject in which he took considerable interest. It seemed to him that by this clause religious privilege, or if he might use the term, religious advantage, was, probably for the first time in the educational or religious history of this country, to be tested by a numerical formula. In connection with the figure four-fifths he did not say that there would be privilege or advantage, but he did say that there would be opportunity for privilege or advantage. He would give an illustration from the artisan population, because they were more migratory in their habits than the agricultural population. It seemed to him perfectly absurd that a Roman Catholic artisan living in a great town like Halifax or Bradford should have advantage or privilege under this clause, while if he went two miles off to seek his livelihood in a non-urban community he was to lose that privilege. It was not a proposition which was capable of defence. It might be a refuge or a mode of escape from a difficulty, but it was not a principle, and he did not think a proposal of that kind could long retain its place on the Statute-book. Then there was another difficulty which he hoped the Government would consider. There were towns in the manufacturing districts which were shrinking as well as towns which were becoming larger. What was the view of the Government in the case of a community which had a population of 5,000 by one census and only 4,500 in the following one? Communities with which he was acquainted had undergone changes of that character within the course of a decennial period. Besides having educationally single school districts, they had in this country commercially single mill districts. On account of great rivalry in a trade a firm might find it necessary to reduce the working power of a mill and this process would lead to a decrease of the working population in the district. This was a very serious consideration, and one which the Government should take to heart. Although his interests related more to an urban than to a rural population there was no reason why he should not say a word on behalf of the rural areas and complain of what he believed would be an injustice done to them by this legislation. There was one point which he hoped the Government would consider. Parliament had given power to rural districts under certain conditions to acquire urban powers. From the Report of the Local Government Board he found that during last year 130 orders had been given under this provision. He suggested that the Government might insert in this clause words which would enable the rural districts to obtain the powers to be conferred on urban districts where the population was 5000. Would the schools in the areas where the population decreased retain the privilege which they enjoyed under the clause when the population was 5,000 and over? He thought the proposal to retain the urban area might be softened and mitigated if they would add to urban areas rural areas which had urban powers. There was no doubt there were many districts of that character which would be brought in if such a change was made, and would have the advantage of the clause. Such a change would be entirely in accordance with the whole scope and spirit of the clause.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 10, to leave out the words, 'in an urban area.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said that this clause, and particularly the words proposed to be left out, contained undoubtedly an element of compromise. A compromise very greatly facilitated the working of any proposal when it reached the country, but it by no means facilitated defence in actual debate. The clause itself was one which was in some measure a qualification—an accepted qualification—of the general scheme as declared by Clause 1, which formed the fundamental principle of the Bill that all specific denominational teaching should be voluntary and given at the expense of the denomination concerned. It introduced a qualification on the rest of the Bill which handed over the whole control of the school, and especially the management of the teachers, to the local authority. It was a clause which of all others required very careful consideration. If inconsiderately or inappropriately applied it might well give rise to great injustice. In what districts could it most conveniently be applied, and in what districts ought it not to be applied at all? Let him take two extreme cases at the ends of the scale. In the large towns, for instance, whatever injustice or inconvenience might arise under the clause would certainly be minimised. But there must be some considerable inconvenience and there must be some of what was called injustice in the single school districts. There they had a school which served an area containing many denominations which were nevertheless handed over to the power of a single denomination so far as the atmosphere of the school was concerned. That was to say, the atmosphere of the school was made favourable to a particular denomination, and therefore without any great stretch of imagination one might see that it was conceivably unfavourable in some measure to the parents belonging to other denominations who were compelled to send their children to breathe an atmosphere favourable to another denomination. Recognising that the clause could not be quite fair and just all round one had to see where the line was to be drawn. It was easily enough drawn to make it applicable to the large towns. It certainly ought not to be applied in the single school districts. Then there were the intermediate districts—the districts which might approximate to those at either end of the scale, and it was among these that they had to draw the line. In the districts which approximated to the rural districts where the single school existed there were considerable distances and it was difficult to apply the clause. Even if they had not considerable distances they would probably have schools somewhat small in point of size, and not improbably in some cases redundant. It would keep some schools which might be redundant—that was to say from every point of view except the denominational. The denominational was not the only point of view to be considered, though it was important. They had also to consider the question of economy. That was not a consideration to which exclusive or even paramount importance should be attached, but still it was an important consideration. When they were dealing with districts where the schools were small it would be somewhat severe on the localities to deprive them of the economic advantage they might derive from having a smaller number of schools, if that was not accompanied by injustice to any denomination. Those were the factors that they had to take into consideration in trying to draw the line. The line had been drawn not too low having regard to the fact that it was in some sort an exception to the general principle of the Bill. Hon. Members ought to consider what a tremendous number of children would be brought under this clause. The hon. Member who introduced the Amendment had spoken of the number of Catholic schools which would be affected as being 77 per cent., but the number of Catholic children which would be affected would be 91 per cent. The number of children belonging to the Church of England who would be brought in would be 57 per cent. He thought that in dealing with an exception to the general principle of the Bill that that was not an ungenerous compromise.

LORD BALCARRES said he was bound to acknowledge that the Solicitor-General had not attempted to place his defence very high. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said how very much worse the clause might have been under certain conditions. He wished, however, to thank the Solicitor-General for having given a reasoned defence of the urban area although it was entirely different from that given by his two colleagues. The Minister for Education had defended the urban area on the ground that elasticity was required, but the right hon. Gentleman did not explain how this particular limitation of population would produce elasticity. The Solicitor-General had said that this clause was an exception to the general principle of the Bill. In that he agreed. The Clause 4 schools were one of the five different kinds of schools which would be produced under this great unified system of education which the Government were bringing into being. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that a certain compromise was necessary and that it was difficult to fix the line of demarcation, but that 5,000 had been fixed as the limit for an urban area. He would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that there were in urban areas schools of as humble proportions as in the rural areas. Then the hon. and learned Gentleman had said that they had to consider the question of economy. He did not differ from the Solicitor-General very much in that respect; but the hon. and learned Gentleman forgot that when a school got Clause 4 facilities it could receive no rent. There were certain departmental questions in connection with which the House ought to have some explanation. The urban area was a Local Government Board term, but it might vary from year to year. The hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan said that last year the Local Government

Board issued 130 separate orders dealing with municipal qualifications in these urban and district areas. When a district which was now a rural area became an urban area or district, he wanted the Government to tell the House whether on the change of name the denominationalists in that particular district could change from Clause 3 to Clause 4. New urban areas were constantly coming into existence and he wanted to know what machinery was to be provided—for there was none in the Bill—by which when a new urban area came into existence the rights of the other urban areas would be safe-guarded. But he took exception to the limitation as to population on rather wider grounds. They had had an explanation from the Solicitor-General, but the hon. and learned Gentleman had not touched the root of the objection of the Opposition; he had not grappled with the real difficulty laid before the Government, and which, so far as he could see, was unanswerable. How was it that in the country districts denominational education was only required on two days of the week, whereas it was to be given on five days of the week in the towns? Was it that the rural child was so much superior to the town child that he could assimilate the religious instruction on two days of the week which it required the town child five days in the week to assimilate? Or were they putting the soul of the country child at a lower valuation than the soul of the town child? This was a matter which excited the most profound interest, and to many people it appeared that by this clause the real interests of religious education had not been safeguarded and perhaps had scarcely been considered by the Government. Therefore, some answer should be given as to what principle had guided the Government in this proposal. He thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to agree to omit these highly objectionable words.

*Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said he took a more hopeful view of the situation than the hon. Member who moved the Amendment, and who said it was hopeless to argue with the Government, and that feeling was strengthened by the fact that the defence of those particular words shifted on every occasion when the point came before the House. First of all the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education said that it was because of the stupidity of the rural parent. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education said that it was for elasticity, and now the Solicitor-General had given another explanation, that of economy. That was the last ditch into which the Government had been driven. If this was the last line of defence of the Government he thought they might congratulate themselves, because he thought it was a very unsatisfactory and unsound one. What did the Solicitor-General say? He said that it was very necessary that no injustice should arise under this clause and that it would be bad economy to avoid injustice by maintaining a large number of small schools. But the hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to forget that possible injustices were fully guarded against under sub-sections (a) and (b) of the clause. He failed to see that any more injustice would be done by the operation of the clause in rural than in urban areas. All they asked was that, subject to the conditions being fulfilled and the extra accommodation being possible, the same conditions should prevail in the country districts as in the towns. He would ask the Solicitor-General whether he really thought it would be in the interests of economy that they should have to build one large school in every district to take the place of the existing schools. That would be the only way in which they could carry out his idea. The economical arguments could not be maintained. The only effective economy was to make the best of the existing schools subject to the conditions mentioned. He hoped the Government would realise the extraordinary character of the limitations laid down. There were many districts where one would not know whether he was in a rural or in an urban area, and they submitted that where the same conditions prevailed in other ways so the same conditions as regarded religious instruction should prevail. At present there were five Roman Catholic schools in his constituency, and if the words in the clause were allowed to remain as they were those schools would be absolutely wiped out. He thought it was fair in the interests of the whole of the country that the question should be considered, and unless some better and stronger reason were given, he did not see why they should not claim the same rights in rural districts as were claimed in the towns. If the Amendment was refused the rural districts would be left solely with the facilities under Clause 3, and it was obvious that they could not in some instances afford the full religious instruction which might be desired. Unless the words in question were left out, there would be no denominational instruction given of an effective character. It was perfectly impossible under Clause 3. This was a matter which went deeply into the hearts of a great many people and was one worthy of serious consideration. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to be impervious to argument, but to accept the Amendment and make the clause apply to all.

MR. LUPTON said that, in reply to the speech of the hon. Member for Barkston Ash, he had to remark that the three defences which had been put forward of this clause were not necessarily inconsistent one with another. He had the honour to represent a very rural constituency, and he thought that there was some objection to the application of the ballot in those constituencies. He had always been on general grounds an opponent of the ballot, because although undoubtedly it was a protection to those persons whose position in life made it impossible that they should be independent, still, on the other hand, if it did not exist, it would make people dare all for the sake of their consciences. Still, these people were in a very awkward position when they were asked to vote in a particular way and their living depended upon their answer. In a village people in authority very often said that when the result was declared they would see how different members of the population had voted. Then there was the question of coal, blankets, and other benefits depending upon the question of the way in which parents were supposed to have voted. A great many of these people tried to inculcate in the minds of the village people that the ballot was not secret. It should be their business to teach the people that it was secret, but still in some districts there was a strong suspicion that it could be discovered which way they voted, and in a small district with only one school it would be very easy to make a very good guess as to how each person voted. Therefore he thought the defence as to the ballot was a good defence and not inconsistent with the other views put forward in support of this clause. There were a great many people in the villages who felt that they had for generations and centuries been trampled upon and now at last had come a great uprising, and the Nonconformists, who had shown their sincere devotion to their religion by building chapels and Sunday schools and by working in them, had sent a large number of Liberal Members to this House to try and defend their position. The Government had recognised the justice of their position by drawing this line, and if the Anglican Party, the Roman Catholic Party, and the Mosaic Party accepted that compromise, it was one which made parish life endurable; but if they would not accept that compromise, if it was still to be war to the knife, there would be continual fighting between determined men. That might be a very good thing, because continued fighting between determined men brought out some of the nobler qualities of the nation. The last election went altogether in their favour and he was of opinion that if another election was fought on the same grounds the result would be the same. He protested against any attempt being made to trample on the Nonconformists in the villages, and pointed out that Clause 4 did not exhaust the possibilities of religious teaching. The Government had really met all legitimate demands without inflicting injustice.

MR. TALBOT, who was very indistinctly heard, was understood to say he had never been able to convey to the minds of those who supported the Government that in trying to remedy a grievance which afflicted a small number of persons they inflicted another grievance which would sorely try the consciences of a much larger section of the community. That was the position he had tried both outside and inside this House to impress on supporters of the Government. It was for that reason that he so cordially supported the Amendment before the House. The Amendment to his mind was one in the direction of simple justice. The Government admitted there was a grievance in the urban district. The Opposition also knew that there was a grievance in the rural districts, but the Government regarded that as infinitesimal, and did not attempt to remedy it. But if that grievance was not remedied either in this House or in another place he thought he would not be rash in prophesying that the country would never rest, because it would leave in the minds of an important section of the community a rankling sense of injustice. During past centuries education in the rural districts had been largely if not wholly carried on by the Church of England, and that was continued down to 1902. Now the Government came forward and said that, because there was some sort of grievance, they would, in order to alter that, turn round on the people who had been carrying on the education in the past and put a grievance upon them. It had been said by many strong Nonconformists that they would never consent to the endowment of popery, but now the House was told that the Nonconformists agreed to this clause and opposed the Amendment to it because the Amendment would mitigate the wrongs of the Church of England and the clause would remedy the grievance of the Roman Catholics. What was that but an endowment of popery by their votes, or in other words putting Rome upon the rates? When their convictions were put to the test of voting in the division lobbies this strong conviction about putting Rome on the rates faded away. The reason why he supported the Amendment was that he desired to see justice done all round. He was sorry to say, because it was a serious charge to make against the Government, that they had selected one denomination for persecution—that this Bill was conceived in a spirit hostile to the Church of England. But when the right hon. Gentleman stated recently at the Table that this was "frankly an undenominational Bill," then they must see that the Church of England must be the body to be attacked, because it was the largest and most influential denomination. If the Government wished to say this Bill was not conceived in a spirit hostile to the Church of England but was conceived in the spirit of doing equal justice to all, they must allow the rural schools the same favours and indulgence as were given to other schools.

Mr. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he had listened to the debate with some profit, for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University had admitted at last that the Church of England was a denomination. Had that been admitted earlier they would have known where they were. To say that this Bill was an attack on that denomination was to argue against the spirit of the Bill. Clause 3 provided for special religious teaching quite equal to that which was given in its regular practice by the Church of England. And when the right hon. Gentleman spoke about placing Rome upon the rates he would venture to suggest that he had forgotten that the special religious teaching was not to be paid for by the local authority. Speaking as one of those who had resisted the imposition of the cost of denominational teaching on the rates, he thought this Bill met the objection to the Act of 1902. He believed it would be found to remove the cause which operated in the minds of those who resisted the payment of what was practically a church rate applied to the teaching of denominational religion in the schools. There were provisions in this Bill quite as strongly objected to by Nonconformists as other provisions were by members of the Church of England. Clause 4 was one of those provisions. He had never taken a directly antagonistic position to that clause, because he thought some special arrangements should be made for special cases, but in the main the principle on which the clause was based had been objected to by large bodies of free churchmen and others throughout the kingdom. In the words now attempted to be struck out the Government had fixed upon an area which prevented the anomaly of a one-school district. A population of 5,000 would secure, he supposed, in every case more than one school in the district, and those who could not use the special facilities would have other provision made for them. If, however, they struck out these words they would revert to a very large extent to the anomalous position now existing. Undoubtedly a Roman Catholic would lose the advantages which this clause gave him if he migrated from the town to the country, but this was not the only advantage he would lose. Many advantages were largely incidental to the circumstances in which a man lived, and it was notorious that many who dwelt in country districts had to lose advantages of different kinds which they would enjoy in urban districts. It was impossible to draw an Act of Parliament which would in every case secure equal advantages for every individual throughout the country, whether in matters of religion or anything else. They very strongly objected to the position in which free churchmen were placed in one-school districts under like circumstances. Hon. Gentlemen opposite who were very anxious to prevent this anomaly did not raise their voices against the larger and more wide-spread anomaly which existed under the old Act, where the large body of Nonconformists who could not avail themselves of religious instruction in the one-school districts had to go without any religious instruction at all so far as the public school was concerned. In fixing upon a population of 5,000 the Government had gone as low as they could, and many of their supporters thought they had gone too low. The Government had been twitted with providing by this Bill five different kinds of schools. Of course, it would have been simpler for the Government to have provided one kind of school, but the five kinds had been attempted in order to provide for the different claimants, of which the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone was one of the most persistent, and if they were twitted now with trying to meet the wishes of the various people throughout the country, he thought they had better confine themselves to the one kind of school, which he thought would have got much more earnest support from the community than this Bill had obtained. However, he thought the Government had hit upon the right provision in this case, and he sincerely hoped they would adhere to the words in the clause, because otherwise they would do a great deal of injustice. Clause 3 combined with Clause 4 made all the provision that anyone could properly ask for.

Mr. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford) said the Government had now thrown over the argument that was used in Committee by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education that the parents in rural districts were so hopelessly stupid that they were quite unable to take advantage of the provisions contained in this clause. What he wanted to point out to the hon. Member for Sleaford and the hon. Member for Norfolk was that the greater part of their remarks had nothing to do with this Amendment, because it was not desired by the supporters of the Amendment that the clause should be made applicable to single-school districts. It was expressly provided by sub-section (b) that the clause should not come into operation unless there was other public school accommodation in the district. There was a distinction, he was ready to admit, between the conditions which ought to prevail in districts where there were several schools and in districts where there was only one public elementary school; but what he wished to press most strongly upon the Government was that no logical distinction could be drawn between a district which happened to be urban and a district which happened to be rural. He hoped even now their arguments might prevail to some extent upon the Government.

*Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) understood the Solicitor-General to say in his reply that there must be a certain amount of injustice under this clause to people living in rural districts. He rather gathered from the hon. and learned Gentleman's interruptions to his right hon. friend's speech that what he really intended to convey was that where Clause 4 was put into operation a certain amount of injustice must be done.

Sir W. ROBSON said it was by no means an injustice to the denomination but to the children to be under the influence of a denomination, perhaps against their will.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN said that if it were an injustice for nineteen children out of a hundred to have to go elsewhere because they objected to the particular religious teaching in a school, surely it would be a greater injustice if in a rural district the whole of the children, perhaps 100 per cent., were entirely refused the denominational instruction they wanted. If it was an injustice for nineteen children to live under a denominational atmosphere to which they objected, surely it was an equal injustice to prevent all the children in a school from getting the teaching they wanted. In the rural districts this would create very grievous injustice. The constituency which he represented would suffer very severely if this Amendment were not carried. He should think that 90 per cent. of the schools would be debarred from justice. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said they must draw the line somewhere, but if they wanted to give justice why draw a line and say that below that line no one was to get justice ? He pleaded most earnestly for a reconsideration of this point by the Government.

MR. BIRRELL said that this clause had been described as absurd, objectionable, and useless, and he therefore felt that he would have been justified in taking the advice to withdraw it altogether. However, parents were sometimes reported to be fondest of their most ill-favoured offspring, and he still adhered to Clause 4. The hon. Member for the Oswestry Division had said that if the words " in an urban area " were struck out justice would be done in a large number of schools. He was therefore encouraged to believe that hon. Gentlemen were only playing a Party game when they refused to admit that there was some merit in a clause of this character—a clause which admittedly benefited the Jews, which tended to secure to an enormous fraction of the children of Roman Catholics the atmosphere they loved, and which, according to figures that had not been contradicted, would also benefit a very large percentage of Church of England children. He did not complain of criticism of some of the conditions of the clause or of these particular words, but he thought that a Minister who sought to incorporate in a Bill of this character a denominational clause ought, he would not say to expect consideration from hon. Gentlemen opposite, but not to be entirely surprised if he received a little. It was absolutely untrue that the Bill had been deliberately framed to injure the Church of England. The right. hon. Member for Oxford University who made that charge had somewhat mitigated its solemnity by saying that anybody who brought in an undenominational Bill would obviously be striking a terrible blow at the Church of England. He admitted that, saving Clauses 3 and 4, this was an undenominational Bill. He had never sought to win over the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite on that subject, because he recognised that the task was hopeless. But an attempt had been made in Clauses 3 and 4 to secure special denominational teaching. They might be sure that the local authorities would take over a very large number at all events of denominational schools, in order to provide the necessary accommodation within their area. The " gap " would in practice be bridged over in an enormous number of cases. Members had spoken as if the facilities offered were worthless. As a matter of fact, in cases where the local education authority took over an existing Church school, catechetical and Prayer-book teaching might continue to be given on two mornings of the week, if the owners and trustees so required, just as before. The Bill struck no blow at the denominational teaching of the Church of England. The only difference would be that this teaching could not be given by the regular teacher of the school, and to describe that as a serious blow at the prestige of the Church of England and at her hold over the affections of a large part of the people was to use language of gross exaggeration. As to Clause 4, he agreed with what had been said by the Solicitor-General upon this matter. The clause was a difficult one to deal with. By choosing such a low limit as a population of 5,000 the Government had made their case somewhat more difficult of argument than if they had adopted the figure of 20,000 or 30,000. But the general design was the same in both cases. The Government had remedied the admitted grievance of Nonconformists, and they disputed that in doing so they had inflicted any real injury on the catechetical and Prayer-book teaching of the Church of England in her own schools. As to the limitation of the clause to urban areas, the object of the Government was to secure that "atmosphere" should only be allowed in a populous district where there was not only suitable public accommodation in the neighbourhood, but accommodation easy of access. In a town district public school accommodation was close at hand; in a country district it might be a considerable distance away. That was why the Government chose an urban area with a population of 5,000. That might be considered unreasonable, but only from the point of view that all schools ought to be denominational. This was an undenominational Bill, and Clause 4 was an exception and had to be limited and restricted in a way which would be absurd if applied to a general law. In reply to the argument used in reference to diminishing populations if the Local Government Board turned a rural into an urban area, then the urban area would fall within the scope and purview of this Bill, and would be entitled to the privileges accorded to schools in urban areas. The noble Lord opposite had spoken as if it was only in certain religious atmospheres that they could get any religious teaching at all. That he entirely disputed. He was aware that there were those who attached great importance to the atmosphere of schools, but he attached just as much importance to Clause 3 schools and board schools. It was hardly for the same reason that Catholics attached importance to the atmosphere of their schools. They did not want to be always thrusting the Catechism down the throats of the children, and Catholics asked for their atmosphere for a very different reason. Catholics desired to exercise control over the books read in the schools and over the teachers who imparted the instruction. So far as those who required catechetical teaching and the religious instruction of the Church of England were concerned, they could get it just as much under Clause 3 as they would in their own religious atmosphere. Atmosphere schools had their charm, and they were recognised under certain restrictions. He was sorry for the exclusions the words would cause, but he rejoiced to think how much the clause would do, and in fixing the limit at 5,000, as large a population as possible was included. If there was any distinction made between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, it was not against the Church of England; because he was thoroughly persuaded that under Clause 3 the provisions would be satisfactory to the great majority of parents, and he believed that when the provisions were made clear to them they would be surprised at the warmth of those people who, without any direct authority, had spoken on their behalf. He repudiated with warmth the idea that special injury was intended to the Church of England, and still thought that the clause, whatever might be its deficiencies, deserved other treatment than it had received.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not follow the defence by the right hon. Gentleman of Clause 3, which did not appear to be relevant to the discussion, but so far as he was concerned he did not join in the attack upon the spirit which had animated many of the leading provisions of Clause 4. On the contrary, he allowed that three great principles were therein recognised which must form essential and vital elements in any final solution of the question. In the first place, there was recognition of the principle of alternative accommodation—undoubtedly an important consideration—the possibility of a parent finding other teaching for his child than that to which he objected. This must enter into consideration in the framing of any final scheme. The second principle recognised was that of parental interest, which in this clause, and in this clause alone, the Government had adopted. It was surely not a very paradoxical idea that a parent should have something to say in the selection of the religious teaching his child was to receive. Thirdly, there was recognition of the claim that the teaching desired should be given by the teacher of the school. The importance of these principles was not to be overrated, and though he thought the limitations in the clause were of an arbitrary character the

Government had shown themselves alive to the root idea that should animate statesmen in a desire to deal with the subject.

Mr. HUNT rose to continue the discussion, when

Mr. BIRRELL rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 245; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 262.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn's-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.

Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt.Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H. Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,Sir J.T.Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clynes, J. R.
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Fullerton, Hugh
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BurySEdm'ds)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore JohnThrogmort'n
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Pike Pease.

Mr. LOUGH said that the object of the Amendment he had now to propose was that the ballot should precede the inquiry.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, after the word 'taken' to insert the words 'previously to the inquiry.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17 and 18, to leave out the words 'regulations made for the purpose by the Board of Education,' and to insert the words 'this section.'"

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause" put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the words 'this section' be there inserted."

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he wished to ask the President of the Board of Education if he had yet framed the regulations for the ballot, with the questions to be addressed to the parents as to whether they wished the extended facilities under the section.

Mr. BIRRELL said he had found the drafting of the regulations and questions for the ballot a somewhat difficult task, and the conclusion he had come to was not to attempt in the short time left this session to come to any final determination as to what the regulations should be, but to publish them in draft as a Parliamentary Paper, so that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen might take them home and consider them during the lamentably short vacation. When the House met again he should be only too glad to receive practical suggestions from all quarters, so as to secure that the ballot should be taken at the time most convenient to the parents, that it should be kept open for four or five days, and generally that the regulations should facilitate people voting.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that the form of question to be put on the ballot paper suggested by the noble Lord at the Committee stage, viz.—

"Do you wish the religious instruction to continue as heretofore?"

was most misleading and dangerous. It would not get anything like the real intention of the parents. What he would suggest was that the question should be—

"Do you desire the extended facilities provided under this clause?"

Lord BALCARRES asked the right hon. Gentleman whether when he published his regulations in the autumn he would give an indication as to how the expenses of the ballot were to be met.

Mr. BIRRELL said he hoped to circulate the draft regulations, which would include the point raised by the noble Lord, before the House adjourned for the recess.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lord R. CECIL said that as the Bill was originally drafted the ballot formed no part of the machinery. The direction was for the local authority to make inquiry as to whether the parents of four-fifths of the children attending the schools were in favour of the extended facilities. That was a very wide and general method of inquiry, and the inspector who held it would be entitled to accept any evidence he thought conclusive as to the wishes of the parents; and if the parents were away from home, it would be quite within the province of the inspector to accept evidence at second-hand as to what their wishes were. That system had been abandoned, which he regretted, and for it there had been substituted the much stricter machinery of the ballot. But even if the ballot were kept open for a number of days, there would necessarily be a certain inevitable waste. However keen the interest of the people might be in any question submitted at an election, political or municipal, there would be a certain number who would not, or could not vote. The result would be that before the extended facilities were given there would be required the consent of the parents of at least eight-ninths of the children attending the schools instead of four-fifths as in the clause. He could not think that that was intended by the Government. He attached enormous value to the principle of the clause, and wanted to see it made available, as far as possible, for the protection of the denominations, and it was in that sense that he proposed the Amendment standing in his name. He frankly admitted that he was not altogether satisfied with the words of his Amendment, but the Government might find other words which would better convey the meaning he desired to express.

Mr. LANE-FOX seconded the Amendment, and hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would accept it, because he believed that it would carry out his real intention. As the noble Lord had pointed out, there would be difficulties in getting a large proportion of the parents to vote. If the right hon. Gentleman would accept these words he would take a great step towards remedying the difficulty. What the noble Lord said about Clause 4 applied to a good many of them. They all recognised the merits of Clause 4, and the spirit in which it had been drafted, and although he condemned Clause 3, he recognised that in Clause 4 they had the best protection of denominationalism that the Bill contained. In regard to the Amendment, he hoped if the Government could not accept the actual words they would see their way to accept some other words.

Amendment proposed—

"In, page 3, line 19, to leave out the words 'the parents of' and insert the words 'of the parents voting those representing.' "—(*Lord Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the parents of' stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. LUPTON said he had listened with great respect to the explanation of the Amendment, but it appeared to him that under it it would be possible in certain districts for the vote of one parent to obtain these facilities.

Lord R. CECIL said that that effect could always be stopped by any single other parent voting the other way.

*Mr. LUPTON said he was putting the case in which one parent had elected to vote and no other parent had elected to vote. Supposing, however, there were ten parents selected to vote who would represent four-fifths or nine-tenths of the parents voting for extended facilities, but the other parents did not vote at all. It was essential if they were to carry out this clause in anything like its original intention that they should have four-fifths of the parents of the children attending the particular schools voting and not merely the four-fifths of the parents who thought it prudent to vote.

Mr. BIRRELL thought the Amendment of the noble Lord was open to some of the criticisms of the hon. Member who had just sat down. This was a novel thing, and he did not think that any of the analogies which had been brought forward with regard to other elections came into play. They proposed to allow under the regulations that in the absence of the father the mother might vote, and therefore they got two authorities who were able to go and register their vote instead of one. That enormously reduced the chances of illness and abstinence rendering the ballot ineffective. His own belief was that these matters would excite such great interest when the attention of the parents had been properly called to the matter—he did not say which way they were going to vote, but he did say that they would get an unusually large percentage of parents and guardians who would vote in this matter. He did not think they could draw any analogy from the voting of people in politics or municipal affairs or for boards of guardians and the like. He was bound to say that if parents could not be induced to vote he did not think it would be right to ignore the fact that they did not vote. He hoped, however, that the parent would vote. When the regulations were considered it would be found that they provided for keeping the poll open for a number of days and at convenient times, and he thought they would have a record vote in cases where the parents were interested. If the parents were not interested he did not think they ought to have schools of this character. Provision would be made in the regulations under which a parent who had not voted could come and say before the public inquiry that he did not desire public accommodation for his child. Having recorded that so far as he was concerned he did not require separate public accommodation for his child, that child would be struck out of the balance of those children for whom other accommodation was required. The question which had been raised might be met to some extent in considering the regulations, but with regard to the general principle he thought they must adhere to the words of the clause.

Lord BALCARRES admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had made out a case against the words of his noble friend, but he contended that there was still one injustice which would prevail, and that was the assumption that the absentee was necessarily hostile to the granting of facilities. The right hon. Gentleman had said that in his regulations he would consider whether he could not keep the poll open for two, three, four, or five days, or perhaps a week, in order to enable the absentee voter to come in and vote. He thought it was hard that if a voter, say a widower, could not attend to vote, his vote should be counted against the *status quo*. He wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the latter part of his speech put a different complexion on the matter, however, for he had stated that in the case of a man who could not vote—say, a fisherman—the poll having been kept open for a week, he would be able under one of the sub-sections to say, at a public inquiry that he did not vote and that he did not require alternative accommodation for his child, and that declaration would have to be taken into account. That had a very practical bearing upon the Amendment of his noble friend. His noble friend said that only those who wished to vote must give a vote. But the right hon. Gentleman said that after the ballot was closed, a man should be able to come forward and say that for a good reason he could not vote, but although he did not vote he did not want the alternative accommodation for his child. If they had twenty or thirty people who did that it would involve a scrutiny of the ballot.

Mr. BIRRELL: But he cannot vote.

Lord BALCARRES: No, that is so, but he comes forward after the ballot has been declared and makes a declaration. There was another point. A child might be three years of age and there might be sufficient alternative accommodation for that child; but if he was twelve or thirteen years of age, there might be no alternative accommodation. A man might say he did not want accommodation for his child, who was fourteen years of age, but there might be cases in the infant department where alternative accommodation was necessary. In any case, this suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to him to involve a scrutiny of the ballot after it was taken..

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 240; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 263.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John

Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)

Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Chesh.)
Buckmaster, Stanley C.
Burns, Rt, Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thoma
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.

Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duncan, C. Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon.Lewis
Hardie,J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaird-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy. Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N.(Doncast'r)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Vivian, Henry
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. Glamorgan
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlexF.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Middlemore,JohnThr'gmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Nield.

MR. EVELYN CECIL moved an Amendment to provide that the extended facilities for special religious instruction should be granted if it appeared that the parents of a reasonable number of the children attending the school desired those facilities. He did not see why the fraction four-fifths should have been specially chosen. It had no special value, and the fixing of hard and fast lines of this kind had some very obvious objections. He thought serious problems would arise owing to the inelastic character of this provision, and therefore he would much rather have the words "a reasonable number" put in instead of "four-fifths." There was no serious difficulty in this. The local education authority could fix what a reasonable number was, and if they did not decide justly in the matter in accordance with the dictates of common sense, then there might be an appeal to the Board of Education. He felt that the argument with regard to shifting population used on the last Amendment applied even more strongly to this, because if one person removed from a district he might by that fact destroy the rights of all the other parents who comprised the four-fifths and who desired this religious teaching. It was therefore not fair to have this hard and fast line drawn. The substitution of the words he proposed for "four-fifths" would obviate another injustice which arose from that fraction's being embodied in the clause. In many cases the voluntary schools had extended their hospitality to children of other denominations, and if they stood out upon this matter the question of four-fifths could never arise and the parents of the majority of the children would lose these facilities because of the hospitality extended to the children of other denominations. Another point which ought not to be lost sight of was the fact that it would be so much more difficult to get the assent of the parents of four-fifths of the children than the objection of one-fifth. It would be fairer if instead of saying four-fifths should require this teaching it was enacted that one-fifth should object to it. If the right hon. Gentleman did not see his way to do that, his Amendment came as near as possible to it. It would permit the local education authority to bear such a consideration in mind, and if a parent was precluded from voting through absence the authority would be able to prevent that circumstance from acting hardly against all the other parents who desired facilities. Such cases were likely to arise here and there, and it would be extremely unfortunate if merely in order to maintain a hard and fast fraction such hardships should be imposed upon parents who by force of circumstances would be deprived of these facilities.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) seconded the Amendment. He thought the hard and fast line drawn by this fraction really placed the Government in an illogical and absurd position. As he understood it, the clause was intended to do some measure of justice to what the right hon. Gentleman had called the "atmosphere" schools. But by adhering to this fraction of four-fifths, if the parents of 800 children out of 1,000 claimed the privilege they obtained it, whereas if the parents of only 799 children voted for it they were unable to obtain the privilege. Did the Minister for Education pretend that in the latter case the school was less entitled to the privileges which the right hon. Gentleman himself had offered on the ground of these schools being "atmosphere" schools? It appeared to him that the hard and fast fraction inserted in the clause would result in a red-tape limitation, and would not afford to those schools the denominational religious instruction they desired and had always received, and for which the schools were founded. He knew of more than one case within his own limited knowledge where although the actual division would be very close under this clause there was no question that a large majority of the parents desired denominational instruction, or that the school had been founded and carried on for that purpose and on that condition; and yet by the exercise of this four-fifths fraction that purpose and condition would be defeated.

Amendment proposed.—

"In page 3, line 17, to leave out the words 'at least four-fifths' and insert the words 'a reasonable number.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. LOUGH said the hon. Member who moved the Amendment appeared to think that if they adopted his words they would get out of some of their difficulties, but the hon. Gentleman had to wrestle hard with his subject and he did not think he had succeeded in convincing the House. It was an exceedingly difficult matter to decide what a reasonable number was. If, as was suggested, the question was left to the decision of the local authority, it would lead to a very undesirable want of uniformity all over the country, and would give great prominence to the religious question at the local elections. The Board of Education had also been suggested as the arbiter of the question. But the colour of the Board of Education changed from time to time, and one Board might settle in one way and the next Board another way, so that no definite settlement of the question would be arrived at. This was a question that Parliament must decide, and, to his mind, it was impossible, consistently with the spirit of the measure, to improve on the settlement laid down in the clause.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON did not think that his hon. friend's Amendment required much wrestling with in order to make out a very substantial case for it. Let the Parliamentary Secretary consider for a moment the procedure which was now provided. Twenty parents applied for facilities. The local authority thereupon was required to have a ballot, after which there was a local inquiry. The ballot would show whether there was a reasonable demand for the facilities for which the twenty parents had applied. The local inquiry would show whether that demand could be satisfied without hardship upon such children as did not desire this particular form of denominational teaching. That must depend on the accommodation which was provided in the area, either—as he would desire to see—in some other place than the school, or in some other public elementary school in the vicinity. On the results of the ballot and the inquiry the local authority could exercise their discretion. Surely if the word "may" meant anything it was that the local authority had a discretion as to whether these facilities should or should not be granted. The Amendment was really the corollary of the retention of the word "may" as giving the local education authority something to exercise its discretion upon. He could see no reason on the face of the Bill as it stood against this Amendment, but he could see very practical reasons for it. Quite apart from the question of machinery there was the reason which lay behind it, namely, that this matter of religious teaching meant a good deal to the persons who asked for it. If people were willing to make application for a particular form of religious instruction, and if they were prepared to go to the ballot, it surely meant that their consciences moved them strongly in a particular direction. He thought the local authority should have a free hand to say whether or not the facilities should be granted. He admitted that the questions raised were of considerable difficulty, but they had to be decided because of the extreme importance which the parties concerned attached to the securing of religious education. They attached the same importance to this right under Clause 4 schools as was the case under Clauses 8 and 9 of the previous Act. He did not think that even with the ballot, the local inquiry, and the other machinery the local education authority would have anything like the difficulty in settling these questions as had to be encountered by the Board of Education in estimating the comparative importance to be attached to the wishes of parents, the economy of rates, and the efficiency of education under the Act of 1902. Yet the Board decided many such cases. The whole machinery of this Bill was now constructed to enable the local authority to come to a conclusion which should be satisfactory to the bulk of the parents. It was all very well to say that the Opposition were raising difficult questions, but they were actually raised by the clause. The Amendment was a most reasonable one and it reduced the clause to something like a rational and valuable provision inasmuch as it would enable the demands of a reasonable proportion of the parents in any locality—circumscribed as it was under the Bill—to enable those reasonable demands to be met by the local authority.

*Dr. HAZEL (West Bromwich) said he had had an experience which he thought was unique in the House, because in the course of his school days he attended two voluntary schools of different types; one a Church of England school and the other a Wesleyan school. Notwithstanding this fact, he was prepared by any vote or effort to put an end to voluntary schools of every description. As an unsophisticated new Member what had struck him most with regard to the last three days discussion, and the Amendments which had been proposed from the Opposition side, was the absolute futility and unreality of the whole debate, for they had had the same Amendments, the same arguments, and the same speeches repeated which they had listened to a month ago. Did hon. Members opposite think that arguments which failed in June were likely to convince the House in July? He would remind them that "Resurrection pie" was not good either in diet or in dialectics. He was one of those who opposed Clause 4 *in toto*. He had voted against the clause once, and he hoped to have an opportunity of voting against it again. He believed that a vast majority of the electors who returned them to this House were opposed to this clause. It was said that they ought to retain the "atmosphere" of these denominational schools. That atmosphere he thought in many cases would be a mixture of sewer gas and sacerdotalism [Opposition cries of "Oh!"] which was good neither for the physical nor the mental health of the children. As to the Amendment, to whose reason were they to appeal? To that of the Bishop of Manchester, or to that of a clerical acquaintance of his who at a public meeting compared the Minister for Education with Judas Iscariot, very much to the disadvantage, he gathered, of the Minister for Education? Upon this question they must be definite. When they were dealing with the use of powers they might very well leave some of them optional, but when they were dealing with figures they must, above all, be definite, and they were definite in this Bill with regard to the majority required. He trusted that the House would also be definite in regard to the proposal which had been made, and reject the Amendment by at least a four-fifths majority.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he had not had the advantage of being a scholar in a voluntary school, but if he had been he hoped he should have had more loyalty to his school than the hon. Member for West Bromwich had. As it was always impossible, in the case of voting, to exhaust the electorate, it was most unfair to the voluntary schools to insist upon a four-fifths majority of the parents of the children on the school register. Another argument in favour of the Amendment was that the ballot was only a preliminary step. If the four-fifths majority was secured it had to be followed by an inquiry by the local authority to decide whether the facilities asked for should be granted. If the parents knew that by registering their vote they would be able to secure what they wanted, they might possibly take the trouble to vote, but the ballot was only a preliminary step to the inquiry. He thought they ought to accept the Amendment and make the number a reasonable one. Was the clause put in with the intention of assisting the Anglican schools or not? Was it simply put in for the purpose of assisting one particular class of denominational schools, namely, those of the Roman Catholics? He did not wish to attribute motives, but he believed there were Nonconformists in this House who had voted for Clause 4 with the intention of admitting Roman Catholics and excluding Anglicans. That was the effect of putting in the condition as to the four-fifths majority, and he maintained that it was not right that such a preference should be given to one class of denominational schools while it was denied to another. The Anglicans had few votes, and perhaps hon. Gentlemen opposite thought that they did not deserve fair treatment at their hands.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) expressed the hope that the Government would accept the Amendment. There could be no logical reason for four-fifths rather than three-fifths or any other number. He had no doubt that the retention of the four-fifths limit would seriously affect the schools belonging to the Anglican Church. Not only so, but it would affect adversely denominational schools generally. They had repeatedly heard from the President of the Board of Education and others on the Ministerial Benches that they did not intend this clause to be a sham, but that they wished it to be a real assistance to persons holding denominational views. If that was so, it was desirable that they should not insist on the 80 per cent. majority. Any hard and fast line must be objectionable. Why should they grant extended facilities to a school in which there were 80 per cent. of the children whose parents desired them, and refuse them to one in which they were desired by 79 per cent.? It was surely far better to leave the matter to the judgment of the local authority. He appealed to the Government to accept the principle of the Amendment, and not leave it to another place to do it for them. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] It was absolutely certain that this Bill would never become an Act with this four-fifths clause. It was an illogical proposition which could not be defended. Such a clause would never find a place in a measure that was carefully considered by the two Houses of Parliament. It was incredible that a Government endowed with common-sense should draw a clause of this kind, considering all the strong reasons against it. There was a sub-section in the clause which rendered it quite easy for a local authority to take the circumstances of a school into consideration, and to decide whether a case had been made out for granting special facilities. What would happen if facilities were not granted? If 79 per cent. of the children required these facilities, they would not be able to obtain them if 21 per cent. required another kind of religious teaching. Surely this was not an example of what the President of the Board of Education meant when he said that minorities must suffer, for here the majority would suffer, because a hard and fast line could not be reached.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 265 ; Noe 105. (Division List No. 264.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins. W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'merset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonport
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dilke. Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A, G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral,
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J. Wynford Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale. E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbigh-sh.)

Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward (Salisbury
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker,Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,W.T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Baring, Hn. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clynes, J. R.
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, AndrewBonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Middlemore,JohnThr'gmorton
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease,HerbertPike(D'rlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford,W.W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smyth,Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset,W.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Bridgeman.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that they on the Opposition side of the House had been told that they had not been sufficiently grateful for the concessions which the President of the Board of Education had made to them. Their object was to make this ugly foundling, this creature of a Bill, into something like fair shape. The House had been told that this clause was an attempt to do justice in special and exceptional circumstances. When they were insisting on the right of the Anglican Church for special facilities which they considered to be the barest justice, hon. Gentlemen opposite were constantly saying that the concessions made to them were so generous as to be almost dangerous. Now what he asked for, and what the Amendmment which he proposed demanded, was justice all round. Why should security be taken only for the minority that was contented with Cowper-Temple instruction, and why should complete neglect be shown for the legitimate interest and rights of the minority who desired religious instruction of another character? If special facilities were given to Roman Catholics and Jews under Clause 4, only when there was security that provision was made for a minority who were content with Cowper-Temple teaching, why should not, by parity of reason, equal rights be given to other communions who desired facilities of the same kind for imparting religious instruction of a special, but different, character? What he wanted, by proposing the Amendment standing in his name, was even-handed justice. What they had asked for, from the beginning of these discussions, was even-handed justice all round, and here they proved the sincerity of that demand, by not asking for any extension of the facilities under Clause 4, but by asking that the Government should prove their sincerity by allowing to the minority an equal right to have its religious principles taught, whether that minority belonged to those who sympathised with Cowper-Templeism or to any section of the Anglican Church, or to the Church of Rome. Whatever section it belonged to, if it conscientiously insisted that religious instruction in a distinct, definite and dogmatic form should be given to its children, it ought to have its demand granted. He thought that this Amendment was one which the right hon. Gentleman the President and the hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Education would have some difficulty in resisting. The right hon. Gentleman said he had attempted to introduce what he called justice by these special facilities. They were content to accept that which was, in their opinion, a small measure of justice, but still, as far as it went, a substantial measure of justice; and they now asked that the same liberty of conscience and the same evenhanded justice which they asked for themselves, should be granted to the minority to whatever section of religious belief that minority belonged, and whether they belonged to the now dominant section represented by the hon. Member for Louth, or to that section which was so well represented below the Gangway. He begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 21, to leave out from the word 'that,' to end of line 24, and insert the words 'suitable provision is made for the religious instruction of children attending the school whose parents desire for them facilities for religious instruction of a different character.'"—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR W. ROBSON said the hon. Member had stated that he proposed to move an Amendment different in character from those which had hitherto been moved from his side of the House in regard to Clause 4, and he certainly made good that assertion, for his Amendment was apparently directed to destroying the denominational atmosphere in the school that would be set up under Clause 4. [Sir HENRY CRAIK: No, no.] The hon. Member thought not. But he would invite him to consider what was the effect of the Amendment, as the very essence of the four-fifths provision would be to give to a particular denomination the exclusive control of religious education in a particular school. He had always understood that that was the essential and valuable feature of Clause 4, but now the hon. Member suggested that there should be something in the nature of all round facilities.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said he had made no such proposal, and had suggested nothing of the kind. He suggested that there should be some provision not in the school, but in the neighbourhood for religious instruction either under the Cowper-Temple clause, or of a special, though different, character

SIR W. ROBSON said he was not dealing with the hon. Member's speech but with his Amendment, which was perfectly clear. In effect, under it the whole of subsection (b) which related to alternative accommodation was to be dropped out, and instead of that subsection there was to be adopted this subsection which the hon. Member proposed, under which even the minority in a school would have their own particular religion taught. He did not know what construction the hon. Member put upon his Amendment, but he could say with tolerable confidence what construction a Court of law would put upon it. It was a provision for minority teaching of a denominational character in the school itself, and this was what was sometimes called "all-round facilities" and at other times "the right of entry." He could not understand the hon. Gentleman appealing to the Roman Catholics in the matter, because his Amendment would deprive that denomination of the religious atmosphere which they sought to obtain. If the Amendment were agreed to Roman Catholics would be pledged to have suitable provision in their schools for all the other denominations who desired it, and that was not what the hon. Member for Waterford and his friends desired. Apparently the words of the Amendment did not exactly express what the hon. Member for Glasgow University desired, but they had to deal with it as it stood. In this form the Government could not accept the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL said the Solicitor-General had taken a somewhat narrow view of the Amendment which had been proposed in order to avoid the confusion involved in the provisions in regard to accommodation laid down in the Bill. Its object was to avoid sending the minority to another school. By the subsection in the Bill before Clause 4 could operate there must be another school to which the minority could go. That was not a just principle. All the Government were bound to do was to see that the minority children were not unfairly treated, that no one's conscience was hurt. It was not fair to say that a new school should be built for a small minority of less than one-fifth. The Amendment deserved far more consideration than had been given to it by the Solicitor-General.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) could not conceive anything fairer, where the majority were to reap the rights given under Clause 4, than that the minority children, instead of being driven to a far distant school, should have suitable religious teaching provided in the school itself. The Solicitor-General had said that this Amendment would be impracticable, but did he know that it was exactly the Government system in Ireland which he himself was now supporting? In some parts of Ireland the children were nearly all Catholics, in other parts nearly all Protestant, but the Government did not leave the minority children in a district absolutely without any religous instruction at all. They provided them with facilities. A minister of religion or some person approved by the Protestant community went to the school at stated times and gave religious instruction. Similar facilities were granted to Catholic minorities in the North of Ireland. Was not that a far more practical method than that proposed in the Bill, which said to the majority that they could have the school to themselves and to the minority that they must find school accommodation elsewhere? By the Bill they were going to dissociate children of different denominations and place them in separate schools. It would be far better to allow the children to be separated for the purposes of religious instruction and to meet together for secular instruction. Then they would grow up together good friends and would not be divided into two camps. This was a reasonable Amendment from the point of view of convenience and economy, and it would enable them to bring up the children without intolerance.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON thought the Solicitor-General had misrepresented the character of the Amendment. What his hon. friend wanted was that some provision should be made for the religious instruction of children who did not desire special facilities under the four-fifths clause, either on the school premises or elsewhere. This proposal made not only for good fellowship among the children of the various denominations, but also for economy, and it greatly facilitated the operation of Clause 4. Under Clause 4 different schools were required. But in that case they had to consider the provision of accomodation not only with regard to the distance of the children from the school but also with regard to the age of the children. It might happen that a local inquiry would show that owing to the tender age of the children for whom facilities were not desired, and for whom, therefore, as the clause now stood there was no accommodation in their own school at these times, there was practically no accommodation at all owing to the distance they were from the other school, while a year later when the children were older this distance might be no objection. Under this Amendment it would not be necessary to find other school accommodation. The children would get their secular teaching together and would be separated only for the purposes of religious instruction. Moreover, the proposal in the Bill destroyed the secrecy of the ballot, for in the process of the inquiry into the question of school accommodation they would ascertain who had voted for extended facilities and who had not. He believed the Government honestly desired that the clause should work for the mitigation of the hardships the Bill would create, and he urged them favourably to consider an Amendment that would assist the object of the clause. The question of school accommodation went to the very root of the matter, and should be dealt with in a liberal spirit by the Minister for Education. Members were now speaking under the shadow of the guillotine, and he knew the right hon. Gentleman had produced at the last moment an Amendment which would to some extent meet some of the hardships involved in this matter. But like so much that had happened in the course of the Bill, the Government had altered, improved or worsened its intention at the last moment, and when no opportunity was afforded for consideration. The whole history of this Bill had been one of large, imperfect, and novel clauses introduced, amended, and in some cases guillotined, without the possibility of discussion. They were here face to face with a clause which endeavoured to meet one of the most crying injustices of the Bill, and he urged the Government even at this late hour favourably to consider an Amendment that would assist the object of the clause.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said he was not certain that the right hon. Gentleman quite appreciated the effect of this Amendment upon the children of Roman Catholics in a school in which they were in a minority, and he hoped as full consideration as possible would be given to the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 324; Noes, 141. (Divison List No. 265.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp't
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick

Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen. (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(SomersetN.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelly, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Cent.)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards,Thomas(W.M'nmth'
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)

Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palme
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, R. (Lanark, Govan)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Sir H. Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hn. Alfred
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed.

"In page 3, line 23, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'other.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the word 'other' be inserted in the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 23 and 24, to leave out the words 'whose parents do not desire those facilities,' and insert the words 'Provided that a child shall not be reckoned in the number of children for whom accommodation is required if the parent of the child shows at the inquiry that he does not require that accommodation for his child, and that no vote has been given at the ballot in respect of the child.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said that they had been assured by the Secretary to the Board of Education that a teacher who refused to give the religious instruction would be got rid of. He therefore thought that it would be better to face the difficulty now and provide that the local authority should appoint a teacher who was willing to give the religious instruction provided for under this section. The object of the Amendment he desired to move was to secure that the teachers appointed in these schools should be fit to do their work. If the section was to be a reality it could only be made so in this way.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, at the end, to insert the words 'if a vacancy arise in the office of teacher, the local education authority shall, in choosing the teacher, appoint a teacher who is willing to give the religious instruction permitted under this section.'"—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 154; Noes, 332. (Division List No. 266.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, W.(T'wrHamlets, S.Geo.
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Chas.Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert (Lanark,Govan
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F. (BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin,S
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James, (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.,
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, J. Emmott (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp't
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard K.
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon. S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.

Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Chas. N. (Doncaster)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset E.
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward,W. Dudley (Southamp'tn
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon. C. H. W. (Hull,W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions upon the Amendments proposed by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 3, at the end, to insert the words 'An appeal under this section shall not be entertained unless it is made before the first day of January nineteen hundred and eight.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 341 ; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 267).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephE.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,John Emmott
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'wr Hamlets,S.Geo.)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex,Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.PancrasW.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)

Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, SirW.D. (Colchester)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, WalterRussell (Scarboro
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thos. W. (Monm'th)
Richards, T .F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(SomersetE.
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(Southamptn
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon.C.H.W. (Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dixon-HartlandSirFredDixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of

Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A .(Donegal, W.)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmortn
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murhpy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert(Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford,W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith,AbelH. (Hertford,East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E. Howard
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Mr. Pike Pease.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 23, to leave out the word 'nine' and insert the word 'ten,'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided: Ayes, 330; Noes 155. (Division List, No. 268).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn. James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A. (InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(SussexE.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.)

Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r'
Harmsworth,R.L(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb.Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk Bghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, William
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncas'tr
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th.)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E)
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor

Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, HonC.H.W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.)
Anson,Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.HnA.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon.Guy (Winchester
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Gov'n
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farrell, James Patrick
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, HenryStaveley(Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Col.CharlesW(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(DublinS.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Meysey-Thomson, E. C.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W.(Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Smyth,Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E. Howard
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson,A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendments made—

"In page 10, line 33, at end add, 'During the time between the passing of this Act and the first day of January nineteen hundred and eight, the owners of the schoolhouse of an existing voluntary school shall furnish to the local education authority any information which the authority may reasonably require as to the title under which the school is held and in the case of a case of a school held under charitable trusts, as to the nature of the trusts and the contents of the trust deeds (if any).' " —*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 33, at end, add, '(5) No child shall be reckoned, for the purposes of the provisions of this Part of this Act relating to extended facilities and appeals with respect to the mode of giving extended facilities, as a child attending a school unless the child has attended the school with due regularity for at least six months, in accordance with the code of Minutes of the Board of Education for the time being in force in respect to public elementary schools, and if any question arises whether a child has attended a school for the purpose of those provisions, that question shall be decided by the Board of Education.' "—*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided: Ayes 382; Noes 102. (Division List No. 269.)

AYES

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Bolton,T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce,J.A.(InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt.Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardig'n
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol,S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,ColonelIvor(Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter

Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,EdmundG.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes,F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H.(Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick,B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dunbartonshire)
White, Luke (York. E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Grey, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Haddock, George R.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Marquess of Hamilton.

Amendments made—

"In page 11, lines 9, 10, and 11, to leave out the words 'or duty in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers,' and to insert the words 'to engage, dismiss, or fix the salary of a teacher.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 11, line 11, after the word 'teachers,' to insert the words 'or of making arrangements under this Act for the use of the schoolhouses of voluntary schools, or of affording or withdrawing facilities under this Act for the giving of religious instruction of some special character'; in line 13, to leave out the words 'this or'; in page 13, line 14, to leave out Sub-section (10)."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 14, lines 6 and 7, to leave out the words 'with the consent of the Board of Education'; in line 8, after the word 'appropriate,' to insert the words 'with the consent of the Board of Education'; in line 13, after the word 'appropriate,' to insert the words 'with the consent of the Board of Education'; in line 17, at end to insert the words 'and (iii) appropriate with the consent of the Local Government Board for any of the purposes of the Education Acts any land acquired by them otherwise than in their capacity as local education authority'; in line 18, leave out the word 'either' and insert the word 'any'; in line 24, after the word 'Education,' to insert the words 'or in the case of land appropriated under this section and not acquired for any of the purposes of the Education Acts, the Local Government Board.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page 15, line 14, at end, to insert the words 'or to any joint body established under Section 52 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, or otherwise established by two or more local authorities'; in line 16, after the word 'contrary,' to insert the words 'or any provisions to the contrary which have been approved by the Local Government Board are contained in the scheme or instrument establishing the committee or body'; in line 17, after the word 'committee,' to insert the words 'or body;' in line 18, to leave out the words 'provisions as to audit,' and to insert the words 'enactments relating to the audit of the accounts of local education authorities'; in line 19, after the word 'provisions,' to insert the words 'of those enactments.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

"In page, 16, line 23, after the word 'Powers' to insert the words 'and duties'; in line 26, after the word 'schools' to insert the word 'vacation'; in line 27, leave out 'in schoohouses'; in line 29, after 'prescribe,' insert 'in the schoolhouse or in some other suitable place in the vicinity, so far as the local education authority in the case of a schoolhouse or place not belonging to them can obtain for the purpose the use of the school-house or place'; line 30, at beginning, insert 'the duty to provide for the medical inspection of children before or at the time of their admission to a public elementary school, and on such other occasions as the Board of Education direct, and the. ' "—(*Mr Birrell.*)

"In page 17, to leave out lines 12 to 18, inclusive; in line 23, at end, to insert 'and that provision shall be made by the Order in Council, so far as is practicable, for the representation of minorities in the number of representatives appointed by the council of each county and each county borough, and on any executive committee appointed by the council, in the proportion so far as possible of at least one in three.' "—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment proposed to the Bill, in page 17, line 27, after the word "to," to insert the words "the provisions of this section and to."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes 380; Noes 100. (Division List No. 270.)

AYES

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs, Leigh
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard

Cairns, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles

Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.

Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallett, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt. Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Robert
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 36, to leave out from beginning of line to the second 'The' in line 38, and to insert the words 'provided that.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 376; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 271.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David(Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham,
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy N.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Phillips, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thos. (W. Monmouth)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)

Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir AlexF
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Haddock, George R.
Hardy,Laurence(KentAshford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay. Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin,S
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
MiddlemoreJohnThrogmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(LiverpoolWalton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot,Rt.Hn J.G (Oxf'dUniv
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent,Mid,)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. G. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Marquess of Hamilton.

Another Amendment made to the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 18, line 9, at end, to insert the words, 'in the exercise of any powers or in the performance of any duties transferred under this provision, the Council of Wales shall be subject to the control of the Treasury.'"—(*Mr Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided, Ayes 366, Noes 90. (Divison List No. 272.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Som'st.)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.
Berridge, T. D. H.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. M. (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brymor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laildaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,JWynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond,William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradfrd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke upon Trent
Ward,W.Dudley (S'thampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J (CityLond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy(Winchester
Beach, Hn.MichaelHugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil Lord R (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)

Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt, Hn. Lt.-Cl. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Other Amendments made to the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 18, line 29, at end, to insert the words, 'and if, before the expiration of that time, an Address is presented to His Majesty by both Houses of Parliament against the draft or any part thereof no further proceedings shall be taken thereon without prejudice to the making of any new draft.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 362 Noes, 88. (Division List No. 273.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Bottomley, Horatio
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hon. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Erskine, David C.

Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon, Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hammond, John
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.
Harmsworth, R. L(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvon-sh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)

Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (FalkirkB'hs)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willians
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)

Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James

Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, J. (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Waterloo, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse. Sir J T (Hudd'rsfi'd

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J (City Lond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Cochrane, Hn. Thomas H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Haddock, George R.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, H.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid
Williams, Col. C. R. (Dorset, W.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, W. R
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Forster and Marques of Hamilton.

Other Amendments made to the Bill.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 327.]

DOVER HARBOUR (WORKS, ETC.) BILL [Lords] (By Order.)

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. W. R. REA (Scarborough), in moving the rejection of the Bill, said he wished to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Bill covered clauses which were not obvious on the face of the measure, and which it was eminently desirable should be discussed before the Bill became law. The Bill virtually handed over a monopoly of the passenger route to France to the South Eastern and Chatham Railway Companies for a period of 999 years. The Schedule showed that in Clause 8 it was provided that the Dover Harbour Commissioners were tied hand and foot to the South Eastern and Chatham Joint Railway Company; they were bound not to promote any rival railway, and also to oppose any schemes that would produce opposition to the South Eastern Railway Company. The Chairman of the South Eastern Railway Company, at a meeting of the shareholders last week, said that the Dover Harbour Board had entered into an agreement absolutely protecting this company from outside competition. Before the House granted any such valuable monopoly to a railway company, they ought to know what return was going to be made by the holders of the monopoly for the benefit of the public. Before granting such monopoly the House ought also to consider the character of the body demanding it. As to the manner in which this company had exercised its monopoly in the past, it was the only company in England which still exercised its right to charge the maximum fares, or what were called express fares for the boat trains. Third-class passengers were not carried at all on the fast trains. The South Western Railway Company ran boat trains to Southampton, which was practically the same distance as to Dover. The first-class fare to Southampton by these boat trains was 13s., but to Dover the first-class fare was 19s. On the South Western Railway the return fare first class to Southampton was 23s., but the company asking for this monopoly charged 37s. 3d. for a first-class return ticket to Dover. The second-class fares on both lines were in the same proportion, and the South Eastern Railway did carry third-class passengers on their boat trains. He could further elaborate his comparison in regard to the limited quantity of luggage, charges for bicycles and the inferior accommodation on the Dover boat trains, but he had no desire to do so. All he would say was that he had been informed that the charges were higher on this line than they were in the days when passengers were conveyed to Dover by stage coach. But that was not the worst of it. The Chairman of this company, when addressing the shareholders, endeavoured to calm their minds in regard to the guarantee, and he stated that the estimated income was based upon the anticipation of a poll tax of 5s. on ocean passengers and an additional shilling on cross Channel passengers. It was too late in the day for a railway company to demand that they should be authorised directly or indirectly to recoup themselves by such an addition to the exceeding high charges they were already making. He did not see why the South Eastern and Chatham Railway should be granted such a monopoly for nearly a 1,000 years. He urged that these railway companies should approximate more nearly to the practice of other companies in the matter of fares, and that they should admit third-class passengers to all their trains.

Mr. VIVIAN, (Birkenhead) in seconding the Motion, said he did not oppose the Bill without some regret, for he recognised that the scheme projected involved the expenditure of money on works which would be for the benefit of the public. But in his opinion the Bill contained clauses which the House ought not to tolerate in a measure of this character. The object of the Bill was to authorise the construction of certain new works in connection with Dover harbour, and it provided that these works should be carried out within a specified period. At the end of the period the Dover Harbour Board were compelled to lease at a rental a portion of the works executed, and other property, to the South Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railway Companies for a period of 999 years. It was provided also that the companies should guarantee the Harbour Board the interest on their debentures. He desired to call special attention to Clause 8 of the lease, as given at page 50 of the Bill. He would only read a portion of the Clause, which was much more eloquent than anything that could come from himself. The Clause said—

> "The Board (the Harbour Board) will also during the like period promote as far as possible the interests of the Companies' undertaking and will not permit or suffer anything which in the opinion of the Companies may tend to diminish the traffic thereon or the profits thereof, but will use their best endeavours to prevent the same and will not enter into any Agreement for the reception or accommodation of any traffic inimical to the interests of the Companies. The Board shall be liable to repay to the Companies all money paid by them under any guarantee given under the provisions of this Agreement. The Board will not during the like period directly or indirectly promote or assist in or assent to the

> promotion of any scheme for a new line of railway to Dover or to the making of any such line or the carrying out of any such scheme, and will at the request of the Managing Committee oppose any application for this purpose. Any breach of this provision shall absolve the Railway Companies from any obligation to give any guarantee of the interest on Debenture Stock."

He ventured to say that no more monstrous proposal was ever placed in a Bill before this House. If in a hundred years the interests of this country demanded that there should be a new line to Dover, and if the promoters of the scheme had the co-operation of the Dover Harbour Board, that board would be liable to repay to these railway companies the whole of the money paid to them for a hundred years. Was not that a monstrous proposal for tying up the interests of the country? According to this paragraph, the Board was not permitted in any way to have an extension or addition to the means of communication between the metropolis and Dover and the Continent. That was a proposal which the House ought not to approve of. Rapid changes were taking place in the means of locomotion, and in a few years it might become important that there should be an electric railway to Dover. Were they to tie their hands by this extraordinary proposal? It might be said that the proposal had received the support of the Harbour Board, the Admiralty, and possibly the corporation of Dover. But he submitted that London had a larger interest in the means of communication between England and the Continent than had Dover itself. He hoped an explanation would be given which would satisfy the House. He hoped also that this clause in the lease would be absolutely withdrawn. The fact that the Bill had been read a third time in the House of Lords considerably shook the confidence of some hon. Members in regard to the machinery of that House for the examination of such measures. Where was the protection for the public? Steps should be taken to secure that the demands of monopolies for privileges from Parliament should be examined far more carefully than evidently was the case at present. He believed that the clause which he had quoted was evidence of the loose examination which the whole Bill had received. The House ought to have some assurance that the Bill would go to a Committee or authority, which would carefully examine all the clauses, so that when it came back to the House they might be satisfied that the public interests had been duly protected. Unless they had a guarantee of that sort when the Bill returned to the House for Third Reading, it would be their duty to secure that the public interests were protected.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Walter Rea.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said that if he had any title to ask the attention of the House to the discussion of this measure it was that he claimed to be impartial. He was not one of the promoters of the Bill, but he happened to be Member for Dover. He was a member of the Government which entered into negotiations with the Harbour Board, the result of which negotiations were embodied in the agreement of the Bill. Therefore he might claim to be familiar with the terms of the agreement although, as the last speaker had said, that did not dispose of the matter. He made no matter of complaint that the hon. Member who had last spoken had not fully grasped the details of the question. He was glad to hear that he agreed generally with the object of the Bill. He believed it was a national disgrace that there should not be proper accommodation at Dover for the great continental traffic which was continually being carried on between this country and the Continent of Europe; and that we ought not to allow the principal port for that continental traffic to be behind other ports. A Bill, if not this Bill, was wanted to give that which Dover had looked for for so many years. The main question was, who was going to pay for the proper accommodation of the passengers? The hon. Member who had moved the rejection of the Bill had made some case about the railway fares between

London and Dover. He submitted that the question of fares was outside the scope of the Bill, which was promoted by the Harbour Board, which contained representatives not only of several public bodies, but of the Admiralty, and on which the representatives of the railway company were in the minority. Was it fair to suppose that a body so constituted would insist on charging higher fares to Dover than would be the case if another railway company came there? The parallel which had been drawn between Dover and Southampton was not a fair one. The hon. Member had said that the trains between London and Dover and between London and Folkestone were worked on a common basis; but this railway ran five boats between Dover and Calais every day. Would anyone say that there was any port in England that did anything of the kind, or could the hon. Member get anything cheaper than the present rates? There was no parallel between the service from Dover to France and from Southampton to France. It was only in the year 1899 that a Hybrid Committee went very closely into this matter and sanctioned the fares which were now charged. The hon. Member for Birkenhead had said that the Northern Railway of France carried their passengers at a cheaper rate per mile than the South Eastern and Chatham Joint Railway Company. That was true, but it must be remembered that this service was always run at a loss. He did not think that this was the proper occasion to try to force the railway company to reduce the whole of its fares; at any rate it was not a practical way of trying to do so. The hon. Gentleman had said that there was a poll-tax of five shillings on all ocean-carried passengers and an additional shilling imposed by the railway company on cross-channel passengers.

*MR. W. R. REA said he was reading from the report of the speech of the Chairman of the railway company, who said that the estimated income of the company was based on a five-shilling poll-tax on the ocean-carried passengers, and an additional shilling levied on the cross-channel passengers.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member said in his speech that they had no power to authorise the imposition of these fares, and therefore he left the House under the impression that the present Bill enabled the railway companies to get more money out of the passengers who used their line than they would have under their ordinary powers. In saying that the hon. Member had conveyed a very wrong impression.

*MR. W. R. REA said he expressly stated that the railway companies were acting under the provisions of the Act of 1902, and he said that they were taking advantage of the present not to exercise a power which they had Bill otherwise enforced.

MR. WYNDHAM said that that was where the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken. This 5s. poll tax has been paid by the Transatlantic and Continental lines which brought passengers to Dover. The hon. Gentleman alleged that a preference had been given, but that was not the case. The Board of Trade had considered this matter, and given their consent to the passing of the Bill, and therefore that objection to it disappeared.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE): The Board of Trade did not stipulate that the five shillings should not be charged; what they did stipulate was that if this five shillings was paid by British vessels the same sum should be paid by German and other vessels.

MR. WYNDHAM said it appeared from that statement that the Board of Trade itself had at all events done something to develop this poll-tax. The receipts from the poll-tax did not go into the pockets of the railway companies, or bring any profit to them at all. It had been in force for a long time, and the proceeds of it went to provide the cost of the accommodation at Dover which everybody thought should be given. Every shilling paid on the Transatlantic and Continental traffic went in the provision of accommodation. It was only fair that the accommodation should be paid for by those who used it, and not a penny charged for this accommodation went into the pockets of the railway company. Nothing could be fairer than that the people who received the accommodation should pay for it, and this system had been in force for ten years. The sum charged was fixed by Parliament itself, and he asked who ought to pay it if it was not the passengers who receive the accommodation? The hon. Member had made a point about the railway guarantee in reference to the traffic to the Port of Dover. But without that guarantee the whole enterprise could not be so cheaply conducted as it was at present. That was the whole point. If the railway companies guaranteed any possible loss by the Harbour Board, up to a million of money, the whole undertaking could be worked more cheaply. The railway companies had guaranteed that amount, and therefore they enabled the service to be worked more cheaply, and those who took on such a responsibility as was involved in that guarantee were entitled to the consideration which it was proposed to give them. Then it was said that there was a monopoly for 999 years, but upon this point there was a perfect explanation. The 999 years lease applied only to a small fringe of land near the shore which was conveyed by the Admiralty to the Harbour Board fourteen years ago. There was nothing new in that. If the railway station which was to be built was placed upon that land, it was only right that the railway companies who had given this guarantee should be partners in the transaction. The Bill only asked the House to ratify an arrangement which the House made and ratified many years ago. The House had itself ratified the poll-tax which the hon. Member had criticised. Another fact which had to be taken into account was that the House in its wisdom had made provision for a National Harbour at Dover; he might point out that the railway companies derived no benefit from that, but had been impeded and put to expense by the construction of that National Harbour. They had handed over their pier to the sole user of the Admiralty, who had full control over it. All these arrangements had been considered and ratified by Parliament. It was of great benefit to the Admiralty that they should have the sole use and control of that pier, and that in return they should give a limited use of it to the company. A Government Department which made hard bargains, and had representatives on a Board upon which the railway company was in a minority, were supporting the Bill. The railway company had given a guarantee for this money, and unless that guarantee had been given the money could not have been raised so cheaply. If, however, other lines were brought into competition with the railway company that guarantee would be taken away. The Bill was brought forward by two public bodies in Dover and was assented to by the railway companies serving Dover, and in it seven public departments, none of which objected to the measure, were concerned. He submitted that it would be in the public interest that it should be assented to.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (MR. EMMOTT, Oldham) thought that the House found themselves in a little difficulty. For himself, he found himself in a considerable difficulty because until that evening he had not the ghost of an idea as to what the grounds of the opposition to this Bill would be. He thought it was an objection as to railway rates which were a little remote from the Bill, and under the circumstances he had not had an opportunity of consulting those upon whose advice he relied in matters of this kind. The hon. Members who had moved the rejection of the Bill, had said that they did not wish to stop the Harbour Works at Dover, but he was afraid if their Motion were accepted they would stop those works. He rose for the purpose of suggesting to the House that the Bill should be read a second time. As an unopposed Bill it would come before the Unopposed Bill Committee which had power to seek advice from Government Departments and could investigate the whole basis of the Bill. The Unopposed Bill Committee also had the power to send it before an Opposed Bill Committee for consideration if they thought fit. He often wished they had the further power of instructing lawyers to oppose the Bill before the Opposed Bill Committees, because he thought sometimes unopposed Bills required further investigation than could be made when only one side was heard. He therefore ventured to suggest that this Bill should be allowed a Second Reading; and that it should go in the ordinary way to the Unopposed Bill Committee, which could consider the matter and decide whether it should go before an Opposed Bill Committee. He would remind hon. Members who were opposing the Bill that if that were done and they were not satisfied with the results they could raise opposition at a later stage when the Bill again came before the House. It would be in his view a very serious thing to reject the Bill at this stage.

MR. W. H. DAVIES (Bristol, S.) said that those who were opposing the Bill were not opposed to the construction of these works. What they objected to were the financial methods which had been introduced to deal with the work of reconstruction. It was a financial question. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had asked how could the money be raised without a guarantee? That was a pertinent question, but he contended that the terms of this guarantee were too onerous. If a railway company was going to benefit by these works the company must necessarily be the company serving the district. He had had a great deal to do with railway companies in connection with dock works, and he knew that they were so powerful that they could extract the most onerous conditions from dock companies. The railway companies were to all intents and purposes the controlling element in the works, and no work could be proceeded with without their consent. It was even worse in this case, because, unfortunately, if a slight breach of the conditions were made by the Harbour Board the railway company could decline further to guarantee the interest on the debenture stock. Consequently the people who purchased it under the impression that it was guaranteed by the railway company might suffer through some small breach of the Dover Harbour Board. He hoped the House would either reject the Bill or amend the clause, because he did not believe any works could be carried out under such onerous conditions.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) thought they should have some assurance from the President of the Board of Trade that this Bill should go before an Opposed Bill Committee, and that the Board of Trade would oppose it in the public interest and see that the public interest was not jeopardised.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) moved the adjournment of the debate for the reason that it would give the Government an opportunity of consulting with those who opposed the Bill and enable them to make a definite statement upon the matter when the Bill came before the House again. If a division was taken now in all probability the Bill would be rejected, and it was to avoid that and to enable the Government to make a definite statement with regard to it that he now moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Keir Hardie.*)

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE hoped the Committee would come to a decision upon the matter to-night. It was late in the session and there was no desire to destroy the Bill. The Bill would require very careful investigation. He thought those experts who advised the Board of Trade upon these matters ought to appear before the Committee. The clause complained of was not one which was essential to the scheme. He thought the promoters of the Bill would be well advised if they consented to meet the Government Department on the matter, and see if their proposal could not be modified. He trusted that the Committee would now allow the Second Reading to be taken. That would not be taking the matter out of the hands of the House. If it were the last opportunity that the House would have of coming to a decision, he could understand the reluctance of hon. Members to give the Bill a Second

Reading, but they would have another opportunity on the Third Reading. He trusted that the Bill would not be thrown out upon its Second Reading, and he appealed to his hon. friend to withdraw his Motion.

*Mr. EMMOTT hoped the debate would not be adjourned. After what had been said he should feel it was his duty to make a report asking the House to send this Bill to an Opposed Bill Committee where it could be more thoroughly examined with the help of the Government Departments affected.

Mr. W. R. REA said that after the assurances he had received he would ask leave to withdraw his Motion. He apologised for not having communicated his intentions to the Chairman, but he was a new Member and he did not know that that was the custom.

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) asked how this Bill had managed to get through the House of Lords without the Board of Trade intervening for the protection of the public especially in regard to the obnoxious clauses referred to?

Mr. MADDISON (Burnley) said this was a very important matter, because there was a very large amount of public work to be done which nobody wished to retard. But the President of the Board of Trade had stated that this particular clause was not an essential part of the Bill. If that were so why could the promoters not get up and give the House an assurance that if the Bill went to a Committee they would consent to the withdrawal of this clause? He regretted that there had been any attempt to withdraw the Motion, because the promoters had it in their power to save these works if they liked. This particular clause giving a complete monopoly to one company was bad in principle and it was also a violation of public policy. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover was a director of this company——

Mr. WYNDHAM said he was not on the managing committee, and he had been speaking upon this question as the Member for Dover.

Mr. MADDISON said that as a director of the company the right hon. Gentleman had an intimate knowledge of the whole affair, and he was greatly surprised when he heard the right hon. Gentleman describe the improvement in Dover Harbour as——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The only question before the House now is the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MADDISON hoped his hon. friend would not withdraw his Motion, and that the debate would not be adjourned. Unless the promoters withdrew this clause he hoped the House would reject the Bill

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 105; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 274.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.
Bell, Richard
Billson, Alfred
Brace, William
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Cairns, Thomas
Clarke, C. Goddard
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Higham, John Sharp
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman

Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Nicholls, George
Norman, Henry
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Br'df'rd
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wardle, George J.
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse,SirJ.T (Hudd'rsf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. Arthur Henderson.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J.A.(InvernessBurghs)
Buxton, Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T.Glen(Renfrew,W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J.(S. Pancras,W
Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crossley, William J
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Erskine, David C.
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. F.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hervey, F.W.F.(BurySEdm'ds
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col A.R
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh W.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Marks, G. Croydon(Launcest'n
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Philipps,Owen C. (Pembroke)
Rainy, A. Holland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Runciman, Walter
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B
Shipman, Dr. John G
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford, East
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Turnour, Viscount
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whiteley,George(York,W.R.
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wortley,Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Walter Rea and Mr. Ernest Lamb.

MR. W. R. REA said that after the undertaking given by the President of the Board of Trade he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Leave not being granted—

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 145; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 275.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling.
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Crossley, William J.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Maj.E.Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Erskine, David C.
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashfd.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hervey, F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm's
Hill,Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset,N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh, W
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leel.)
Pearson, Sir W. D. Colchester
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Cheshr
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Thompson, WMitchell-(Lanark
Turnour, Viscount
Villiers, Ernest Amhurst
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Russell Rea and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

NOES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Alden, Percy
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Brace, William
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir JohnT.(Cheshire
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Clarke, C. Goddard
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herb. J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Horniman, Emslie John
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Nicholls, George
Norman, Henry
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary, Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Schwann, Sir Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Danel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse, SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr Howell Davis and Mr. Wardle.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

POST OFFICE (LITERATURE FOR THE BLIND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked the Postmaster-General whether he could state what the cost of carrying out this clause would be. Having regard to the large profits made by the Post Office, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be able to make a further concession and give greater facilities than those proposed by this clause.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said he was surprised that the Government should proceed with the Bill at this hour. He thought the Opposition had treated the Government very fairly to-night and, therefore, he moved to report progress.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) suggested that, if the hon. Gentleman would go to bed, they would get on very well.

The Chairman declined to accept the Motion.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said it was impossible to make a a complete estimate of the cost. The maximum loss involved would be about £500. He was asked why in view of the large profits a further concession should not be made. This Bill only took powers to give the facilities now proposed.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment; read the third time, and passed.

REVENUE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair]

Clause 1:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, after the word 'paid,' to insert the words 'to the authorised methylator or to the person by whom the spirits are received, as the case may be.'"—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

LORD TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said that there was no one with any knowledge of the House but would admit that the Opposition had not treated the Government in an unreasonable manner in regard to this Bill. They had sat up night after night to assist the Government in many respects, and he hoped the Government would meet them on this point in a reasonable spirit. He sincerely hoped that the Government would not take more than the Revenue Bill that night. He therefore moved to report progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Viscount Turnour.*)

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said they were very much obliged to the noble Lord, but he would remind him that the Revenue Bill was entirely unopposed.

LORD TURNOUR said that after that assurance he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original question put, and agreed to.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this clause as amended stand part of the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said that this was a most important matter. The amount of spirits affected by this Resolution was over 250,000 gallons.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the only question before the Committee was that this clause stand part of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the clause would be much more satisfactory if the whole amount of the duty was reserved. The matter had been dealt with by the Departmental Committee, and one of the first recommendations of that Committee was that an allowance should be granted on all industrial spirit. The question which he desired to ask was what was the amount of the drawback on the duty on spirits exported?

MR. ASQUITH said the remarks of the hon. Member for the West Derby Division of Liverpool were based upon an ignorant misapprehension, because this alcohol came in duty free under existing legislation. The whole effect of the clause was to carry out a recommendation of a Departmental Committee appointed by the late Government and to free a very important British industry from a charge imposed on it by extra restrictions which put it in a position to compete freely with foreign competitors in foreign markets.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. BERRIDGE (Warwick and Leamington) moved a new clause providing for the extension of the provisions of 4 Edward 7, Chap. 7, Sec. 9, as to relief from income-tax on premiums on insurances.

New clause—

"The provisions of Section 9 of The Finance Act, 1904, shall apply in relation to life insurances or contracts for deferred annuities effected in or with any insurance company lawfully carrying on business in Great Britain or Ireland, and accordingly such section shall be read and construed as though the words 'or lawfully carrying on business in Great Britain or Ireland' were inserted therein at the end of the fifth line thereof after the words 'British possession.'"—(*Mr. Berridge.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Question, "That the clause be read a second time" put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

CROWN LANDS BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. CLAUDE HAY said that, before this Bill passed he wished to ask one question which he regarded of some importance and which had not yet been cleared up. Under the provisions of the Bill representation in this House and responsibility to this House in respect to the dealings with Crown Lands had been altered. Hitherto the Treasury had been responsible to the House in respect to all acts in connection with Crown Lands. Under the provisions of this Bill, however, certain of the powers hitherto exercised by the Treasury had been transferred to other departments of State. What he desired to ascertain was whether the Financial Secretary was responsible to the House in this matter or whether when they approached or attacked him on the subject they would be referred to some other department because of the changes which had been made.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) said the administration of Crown Lands had been in the hands of the Commissioner of Woods and Forests. All that this Bill did was to appoint another Commissioner who was to be the President of the Board of Agriculture for the time being. If the President of the Board of Agriculture were in the House and the question was put in reference to that particular portion of the Department of Woods and Forests in which he was interested, he (Mr. McKenna) had no doubt the question would be directed to the Minister of Agriculture. But so far as the general administration of Woods and Forests was concerned, the Treasury remained responsible to the House. It had been thought desirable that so far as the agricultural portion of the Crown lands was concerned a Commissioner should be appointed who had a more particular knowledge of that particular kind of land and who would be more familiar with the work than the Financial Secretary to the Treasury could possibly be.

Bill read a Third time and passed.

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, to whom the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill was referred, that they have power to consolidate the said Bills into one Bill.—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 13th July.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 26th July, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Sutton District Water Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill [H.L.]; Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

North West London Railway Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bills passed, and returned to the Commons.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Read 3^{a} (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT, NO. 3 (1906).

Correspondence respecting the attack on British Officers at Denshawai.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3680. Russia (Taganrog).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Thirty-fourth Annual Report for the year 1904–1905. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer for 1904–1905.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1906.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Annual Report for the year ended March 1906.

PRISONS (IRELAND).

Twenty-eighth Report of the General Prisons Board, Ireland, 1905–1906.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS, 1906).

No. 523. The Telegraph (Foreign Written Telegram) Regulations, 1906, dated 16th July, 1906.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Order made by the council of the borough of Nelson, and confirmed with certain Amendments by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain shops within the borough.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DOGS BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1^{a}; to be printed, and to be read 2^{a} To-morrow. (*The Earl Carrington.*) (No. 175.)

CHARITABLE LOAN SOCIETIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1^{a}, and to be printed. (No. 176.)

CROWN LANDS BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1^{a}, and to be printed. (No. 177.)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

POST OFFICE (LITERATURE FOR THE BLIND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed, and to be read 2ª on Monday next. (*The Lord Granard* [*E. Granard*].) (No. 178.)

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

[SECOND READING].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, this Bill is of a purely Departmental nature. It becomes necessary from time to time for the Postmaster-General to acquire new sites and new premises owing either to the growth of Post Office work or the increase of population. This Bill is similar to the one which was brought in by Lord Stanley in 1904, and it has passed the House of Commons without amendment.

Moved "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed for Monday next.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the object of this Bill is to amend Section 82 of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882. The Bill provides that a banker receives payment of a crossed cheque for a customer within the meaning of Section 12 of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, notwithstanding that he credits his customer's account with the amount of the cheque before receiving payment thereof. There have been many representations to the effect that the present state of the law as declared by your Lordships' House is unfair to bankers, and a Bill similar to this one was introduced by the noble and learned Earl who occupied the Woolsack last year. I think it right and proper that such a Bill should pass, and I hope your Lordships will give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

STATUTE LAW REVISION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the object of this Bill is further to promote the revision of the Statute Law by repealing enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary. This Bill has been passed by your Lordships on two previous occasions on the Motion of the noble and learned Earl the late Lord Chancellor. I have promised to consider certain Amendments when the Committee stage is reached, and I hope to have the assistance of Lord Robertson, whose great experience will be invaluable, in considering those Amendments; but for the present I hope your Lordships will not place any difficulty in the way of again passing the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL. [H.L.]

Order of the Day read for the consideration of Commons Amendments.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I propose to move that this House do agree with the Commons in their Amendments. One is a privilege Amendment with reference to finance, and, of course, could not have been introduced in this House. But, with reference to the substantial Amendment, I have to observe that it is the law already. The gentleman who in the other House moved the introduction of it probably was not aware that the exact Amendment in terms occurs in another Act. That was the only reason why it was not introduced originally in this Bill. But as I would rather get the Bill with a redundant section in it than not get it at all, I move that this House agree with the Commons in their Amendments.

Moved, "That the House do agree with the Commons in their Amendments"—(*The Earl of Halsbury.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN COUNCIL SCHOOLS.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, in rising to call attention to the published Returns on the subject of Regulations for Religious Instruction in Council Schools, I wish to state at once that it is not my intention to say anything of a controversial character, except so far as controversy may indirectly arise from a mere statement of what seem to me to be the plain and indisputable facts. If controversy should arise afterwards, it must be, so far as I am concerned, on the strength of these facts rather than because of any wish on my part to raise controversial issues.

The facts of the case are these. About nine weeks ago I asked for, and the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council most kindly assented to produce, a Return, which should show what is, as a matter of fact, the religious teaching now given in the council schools throughout the land; and I hope I may be allowed for a moment to congratulate and thank both the noble Earl and the staff at the Board of Education for the promptitude and the fullness with which they have obtained that information, and for the way in which they have made it accessible to your Lordships in a space of time which, unless my experience is mistaken, is very much less than that which is usually required for the compilation of statistics so voluminous. I have further to thank the noble Earl for his courtesy in giving me the advantage of a few hours over the rest of your Lordships by sending me the proof of the document before it was finally printed off. I am, therefore, in a position of some little advantage, by a few hours at least, over the rest of your Lordships in my knowledge of the facts to which I wish to call attention.

I am quite sure it is not necessary to apologise for calling attention at this particular juncture to these detailed facts, because the position in which we stand is this. In a few days we are, as we unofficially know, to be invited to assent to a proposal which takes the form of transferring to the local education authorities the control of religious education now exercised by the trustees or managers of the denominational schools of the country. There are, of course, large and noteworthy exceptions which are meant to become operative if the proposal were carried out; but such, in general terms, is the proposal that is made. It is sometimes put in the form that we shall be asked, or the country will be asked, to allow that in our elementary schools simple Bible teaching shall be given in lieu of Church dogma—a statement of the case so preposterous that I almost shrink from quoting it. As though simple Bible teaching had not been the backbone of the whole religious instruction that has been given in Church schools for generations past!

I am not going now into the merits of the proposal that a transfer should take place of jurisdiction in these matters from the present holders of that power to the authorities of the county councils. I am not at present going to say whether I think the proposal good or evil. Opportunity for that will be offered hereafter, and I think I shall ask your Lordships to let me avail myself of it pretty fully. Let us to-night entirely dismiss the question as to whether the proposed transfer or change is a good one or a bad one. Some people will say that it is a good thing to do; and some that it is a bad thing to do; but everybody, whether he thinks it good or bad, at least desires, I imagine, to know what it is that we are invited to do; that is to say, what will be the working, as far as experience can tell us, of the new authority who will be asked to become responsible in the main for the religious teaching in what would then be called the transferred schools; what, in short, does the term "religious teaching in council schools" really mean or connote as we use it now ?

There are two groups of contradictory critics upon the subject of religious teaching as given in council schools to-day. There are those who, taking a very strong view upon the subject, regard that teaching as so erroneous in its character, so misleading in its range, that it becomes practically worthless, or, as some would say, even in its degree harmful when used in our schools. On the other hand it is contended that this particular form of teaching is quite excellent, that it is the very thing that corresponds with the general wish of the English people, that it is the very thing that we ought to desire to see everywhere, and that we should thankfully welcome such a change; and we are frequently told, as I have said, that it means the substitution of simple Bible teaching for Church dogma. That is the most misleading account of it that could possibly be given, but whether I look at one of these extremes or the other, I am bound to say that I personally differ from both of them, and I venture to think that the generalisations upon that subject to which the extreme partisans on either side have given utterance are largely based upon an insufficient study of the actual facts as they are. Therefore it was that I asked that this Return might be presented to Parliament, and I welcome the fact that it is before us to-day.

The Blue-books which are now in your Lordships' hands give us full information on this subject, but they do not give it at the first glance. They will not give it on an easy or cursory view. They require a good deal of study and critical investigation before we are able to arrive at a conclusion which is of real value upon the basis of what has now been placed in our hands. I know that many of those who have looked through the pages and found one page after another filled with a complete and formulated system of biblical instruction, accompanied by admirable prayers and suggestions for moral teaching and the rest, say—

"What more can anybody want than this?"

One critic said to me an hour ago,—

"I only wish I had been taught anything like it at my public school."

I do not controvert any satisfactory impression which may be derived from a cursory study of the pages of this rather voluminous Return. I am thankful to know, in this official way, how many of the local education authorities throughout England have recognised what I am quite certain is the feeling of the English people in favour of religious instruction; how they have set that forth in carefully drawn syllabus after syllabus; and how they have in many cases endeavoured to secure that it shall be efficiently and satisfactorily taught.

I would go further still. I can speak from some little knowledge of what was the case in some of the small country school boards where this kind of matter, and, indeed, all educational matters, were treated in a very cavalier and unsatisfactory manner; and I rejoice to recognise the gain which in such cases arises from the incorporation of these little bodies under the larger authorities, which now deal with the subject for the county as a whole and require them to follow a religious syllabus which that authority lays down. But before you come to a decision as to this being on the whole a satisfactory state of matters which is disclosed to us in the Blue-book, I am quite certain that you want to give to it more detailed consideration, more critical investigation of detail, than has been practicable for those in whose hands the Blue-book has only been for a few hours.

I put it, roughly, thus. There are in England and Wales, in round numbers, about 300 educational areas, each with its own authority. In a great majority of these, religious teaching of some sort is now being given, being enjoined by the authority. There are a few marked and noteworthy exceptions, chiefly in Wales. In Cardiganshire, for instance, out of seventy-five schools, there are sixty in which no religious education of any kind is given. That is stated specifically in the Blue-book. In Carmarthenshire, out of 104 schools, there are sixty-nine in which no religious education of any kind is given, and that under the sanction and authority of the local education authority, to whom, remember, transfer would be made of the schools which are now, as regards religious instruction, under Church control, Roman Catholic control, or denominational control of some kind. But I do not propose to expand that point. I am the less ready to speak

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

about Wales because I know how much expert knowledge is required for any due treatment of Welsh questions, and there are present several of my episcopal brethren from Wales, and we may hear a statement from one of them on this point.

Out of those 300 areas, in the great majority of which religious education is given, only about one-third provide for the religious instruction being inspected, and that is the real point to which I wish to call your Lordships' attention. The religious syllabuses, however excellent, and the regulations about religious instruction, however clear, are deprived of a great part of their value if there is no inspection whatever as to how far the syllabus is being carried out. To give a syllabus of religious instruction and regulations as to how it is to be carried out, without arranging for any inspection or examination of the results, is, to my mind, unfair all round. It is unfair to the public, because the public are unaware how far what they see upon paper is actually being done in the schools if the instruction is not inspected. It is unfair to the parents, because the parent, who may trust to the syllabus as he sees it published, has no means of knowing whether the teacher is really imparting it to his child or not.

But, above all, it is unfair to the teachers, and especially to the young teachers. No teacher ought to be subjected to the temptation, for it is nothing less, of dealing inadequately with one branch of his or her responsibilities, because he or she knows that that part will never be inquired about or inspected. We have to deal with a large number of young people, upon whom great pressure is being brought with regard to the teaching of secular subjects. If they are exposed to the temptation of putting alongside the inspected work the religious teaching which is not to be inspected at all, they are under a temptation to which I say we have no right to subject them. It is unfair to them again, because we necessarily lead them to regard instinctively as unimportant a branch of work which nobody cares to inspect. It is unfair to them, lastly, because there is no possibility of knowing which teacher is doing the work well and which teacher is doing the work ill, and, therefore, of rewarding by commendation or otherwise those who are throwing their heart into the work assigned to them.

It is important, therefore, if inspection is so vital a thing, that we should realise how far it is at present being carried out. I therefore ask your Lordships to note the figures upon that point. There are in England and Wales 327 education authorities. Of those thirty-four have no Provided schools. There are thus 293 education authorities which have Provided schools in their area. Of these 293 authorities, 225 issue regulations about religious teaching, and sixty-eight issue no regulations. Of the 225 which issue regulations, exactly 100 make arrangements for inspection of the teaching given; 125 do not. It will thus be seen that about two-thirds—the exact numbers are 193 as against 100—either enjoin religious instruction which is not inspected or make no arrangements for such instruction at all. That fact must materially affect the judgment which we form upon the admirable accounts given to us in this Return of the instructions laid down by the education authorities as to what ought to be done.

Uninspected teaching is always apt to to grow either slack or non-existent. The teachers who at this moment give religious teaching are in a large measure trained for that particular task. The teachers who will be giving it in the future will be in an increasing degree untrained in that particular form of duty, and if that be so, we do not require a great experience of human nature to see where the peril lies when the work of a trained teacher in secular matters is to be accompanied by the work of the same teacher in other matters for which he or she has not been trained, and about which there will be no inquiry whatever as to how it is being done. I desire to avoid generalities and to give you examples of what I mean. There are some local education authorities whose work I for one have always commended. So far as the law allows, teachers, keen, honourable, conscientious, and for the most part in the past trained to their task, have done their very best and done it admirably. I would ask anyone to examine in detail what has happened in our great towns, in London, Liverpool, Southampton, and many more, and see how well the time devoted to religious teaching is shown to have been spent by the result of the inspection which has been made of it by qualified people whose reports are accessible to all.

And so with the counties. At this moment the work being done, on the lines of the syllabuses here set forth, in Surrey, in Hampshire, in Oxfordshire, in a part of Lincolnshire, and in many other places, is as good as the law as it at present stands allows it to be. I said one part of Lincolnshire, and I would like to rest a moment on that as a curious example of the haphazard good or bad fortune which may arise in a particular county with regard to the educational work. Lincolnshire has three education authorities. One of these sets forth a very careful syllabus and has the work done under that syllabus carefully inspected and examined. The other two authorities have no syllabus and practically no regulations at all. I know nothing as to the reasons for this difference, but I imagine that it may be due simply to the fact that on one of these three education authorities there happen to be some men who are keen about this matter and set it forward. I do not want to dwell wearisomely upon the statistics of different places. Some of the work is quite excellent, and I repeat again what I have many times said as to the commendation which I for one am prepared to offer of that work when competently done by trained teachers under inspection. But all those conditions are wanted.

Now, with regard to the other set of education authorities: those, I mean, who make no arrangement for inspection. The accounts about them are, of course, difficult to obtain, and they vary considerably in detail. As soon as I knew there would be a discussion on this subject I myself set on foot an inquiry of my own, in a very unofficial and amateur kind of way, as to what was happening in a few counties and boroughs in different parts of England, taken almost at random, and I especially avoided, in the inquiry which I addressed to some of those who I thought could help me, giving any lead in the matter beyond simply asking what was the nature of the instruction given, whether it was inspected, and if so, with what results. My inquiry, I do not deny, was specially directed to some of those places in which I thought it not improbable that there would be no inspection, but about which we had, until this Blue-book was published, no official knowledge one way or the other. The replies that have been sent to me are very numerous and voluminous. They are necessarily of a confidential character, because they come largely from teachers in schools, members of local education authorities, and school managers. I therefore do not feel myself at liberty, with fairness, to mention publicly the names of those who have given me this information, or the particular borough or county to which they refer; but lest I should be supposed to be possibly misleading someone by reference to letters which are in that sense anonymous, I will, with the greatest pleasure, place the actual letters themseves in the hands of the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council or any other competent authority who will respect their confidential character.

I would ask your Lordships, that being so, to pardon me if I make a few quotations and say a word or two about them. Some of them deal with matters which may seem trivial. If you take it by itself, an account of somebody's visit to a school and what he or she found there on a particular day is a petty matter, but it is because it is given in this personal and detailed manner that it seems to me to have a special illustrative value of its own. Here is an account of one large town in England by a most competent observer. He says—

> "No syllabus or instruction of any description has ever been issued by the Education Committee in regard to the religious instruction in the council schools of the borough, the head teacher in each of such schools having an absolutely free hand in the matter. There is no inspection and no special supervision of the religious teaching in such schools. An attempt was made about three years ago to have a definite scheme of religious teaching adopted, and copies of other schemes were procured and circulated amongst the members of the Education Committee. For some reason, however, these schemes were not even discussed, and the matter was allowed to drop, the inference being that no member had the courage to introduce the subject in the face of probable acrimonious opposition on the one hand or absolute indifference on the other."

Turning to another large borough, the information in my possession is to the effect that a syllabus is published—it will be found in the Blue-book—but there is no inspection of any kind. A highly qualified informant tells me that this—

"acts as a deterrent and probably justifies the prevailing view that in many schools the whole subject is largely shelved."

He gives instances, from which I take the following. A headmistress says—

"The lessons are regularly given in my schools. The head teacher goes round to see that this is done. Formerly the Board Inspector made periodical visits during the time for religious teaching, and reported adversely if the time table were broken. For the past five years or more no such visit has been paid. The whole thing has gone to sleep. Practically it depends upon the voluntary effort of the head teacher."

In another school in the same borough, where, as I have said, there is an ample syllabus, the report is—

"In the upper classes there is Bible reading only; no teaching; questions are discouraged."

In another school the headmistress says—

"A syllabus is carried out because I insist. If I did not it would slide. 'Let sleeping dogs lie' is the policy. Bible reading only obtains in many standards."

In another—

"In the Girls Department Bible reading takes place, and to all intents and purposes is simply a reading lesson in all standards except 1 and 2, where simple teaching is given. Questions are discouraged."

In another—

"The definite tradition of the school is simple Bible reading without any distinct explanations."

The mistress says she boldly departs from this tradition, though not supposed to. She is acquainted with teachers in the borough who order the children to read through six or seven verses of the Bible, and then close the religious teaching, regarding this as sufficient, and she adds—

"The tendency of the religious teaching generally is to degenerate into a reading class."

A lady writing from another large town says, and this is one of the cases in which I have described the details as trifling, but not for that reason insignificant—

"I vouch for the strict accuracy of the facts, and could give many more like them. During the supposed scripture time I found the headmistress of an infant school preparing in the central hall a selected number of children for some entertainment to the music of a highland jig. This was distinctly audible in all the class-rooms. In one the teacher was really trying to teach 'There is a green hill.' In another the religious instruction took the form of the children singing one hymn after another while the teacher prepared the sewing. It was a typical case of a non-religious atmosphere. As for the pupil teachers being regularly put on to take the scripture lesson, the case is really worse than it appears, for in this region, including several big towns, there is no religious teaching whatever in the pupil teacher centres; teachers are being turned out wholesale, absolutely ignorant of the Bible, more so than anyone would believe who is not in personal touch with them."

A letter from a real educationist in a large town in another part of England describes how a leading headmaster happened to be Secretary to the Social Democratic Federation, and goes on to say—

"Shortly afterwards I found the syllabus of religious instruction was removed from the board where it had hitherto invariably been found, and a syllabus of lectures to be given under the auspices of the Social Democratic Federation at their rooms in ——— Hall, ———, was in its place. The headmaster's explanation was 'that the syllabus was dirty and another was being made out. The Social Democratic Federation syllabus had been put up temporarily because it was of an educational character, and the religious instruction was being given as usual'."

The writer continues—

"Another school in the borough had twenty minutes allotted to religious instruction (9 to 9.20 a.m.) on its time table, but for months from its opening none had been given. I paid it a visit between 9 and 9.20 a.m. Secular subjects only were being taught. I notified the fact in the log book. Afterwards the religious instruction was regularly given. . . The local education authority is fair as local education authorities go, but far from sympathetic with denominational schools, and not much so with religious education. One of them with marked approval stated, 'religion is a matter of the heart.' This truism, however, was marred by its application, which was to have no religious instruction at our pupil teachers' centre. The Council, notwithstanding that a combined meeting of denominational managers—Church of England, Roman Catholic and Wesleyan—sent a deputation to urge that the pupil teachers should receive religious instruction, absolutely refused in a contemptuous manner the request. I have no reason to think that any member of the local education authority interests himself in the giving of the religious instruction in the council schools. On the other hand, I have cause to believe that a teacher who gave distinctive Christian teaching would be liable to unpleasant attention for introducing 'dogmas.' The clergy had much to do with keeping up the religious teaching in board schools. They cannot be elected to councils of boroughs and county boroughs. Outside the council their influence on the local education authority is little or *nil*. The ——— School Board would allow no common religious syllabus nor any examination or inspection of the religious instruction. Our opponents said, 'The managers must see that it is properly given.' Hence my efforts as a manager. The local education authority nominally continue the same system, but the managers to interest themselves are not to be found."

In another large borough there is a strange contrast between what is done for the quite little children, and what is done for the bigger ones—

"Even though in the lower part of the Higher Grade School prayers and hymns were said and sung, and Bible teaching given according to a scheme agreed upon from the first, yet when the upper part of this school was made a Science Department all religious observances were, and have since been, excluded from this department. This is a most unfortunate state of things, for children of eleven or thirteen years of age, transferred from any of the Elementary Schools to this Science School then cease to receive any religious instruction of any kind, and never hear a prayer nor sing a hymn in school."

What must the effect of all this be on the mind of an intelligent boy or girl? I will now read a portion of a public letter which appeared in the papers a few months ago. The writer, a teacher, said—

"Everybody knows that there is only one solution—Secular Education. Is the time ripe for it? The Trades Unions and all the progressive forces in the country think it is. . . . What better way of making a bigot could be devised than that of teaching a child the myths with which the Bible teems? It is said that there is no religious difficulty inside the schools. Then teachers must have elastic consciences. Is it no difficulty to require an educated man or woman to teach defenceless children as facts——"

The writer here mentions a series of Old and New Testament narratives, in prose and poetry, chosen with a strange ignorance of their real character and explanation, and includes, at the close, the narratives of the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord—

"The fight is between superstition and reason, between mystery and truth, between darkness and light. . . . . Bible teaching, if such there must be, is the work of parsons. Let teachers say, 'away with it.'"

I commend the gentleman who wrote that letter for his straightforward candour. My point is not to condemn him for saying what he believes, but to point out that he is not merely the head of a higher grade school, but the chosen authority at the head of the pupil teachers department in that borough. That means that the local authority, knowing his opinions, entrusts him with the training of pupil teachers who are going to be charged with the responsibility of giving religious teaching. And to that authority among others the Church will be asked to transfer her schools. A man writes from another large town—

"There is no syllabus at present in the Council Schools in this town. The teachers are authorised to read a passage of Scripture and explain it. Consequently there is Bible teaching of a sort in some of the schools, and in some there is none. There is no inspection or examination of any kind. A Nonconformist parent—principal reporter to the Radical paper here—complained bitterly to me the other day, and said he sent his younger children to the Church school, and would sign the petition which we were then organising (in favour of the continuance of denominational teaching), because he found that his daughter, who had been during the whole of her childhood in Council Schools, did not know the simplest facts of Bible history. *E.g.*, she asked him who Samson was, and what his history was, when she was fifteen years old. Her father said to me, 'I do not agree with everything that is taught in your schools, as you know, but I want to sign this petition because I regard the continuance of the Church Schools as the only remaining guarantee for any religious teaching at all in our Elementary Schools.' This from a middle-aged, intelligent, Radical Nonconformist."

My correspondent goes on to say—

"I attach very little value to the religious teaching in the Council Schools here. No doubt, if they so wish, the teachers can give a good deal of good teaching under a loose system such as ours, but the temptation to omit it altogether is too great for the majority of them. May I add—what I have no doubt others will have pointed out—that a syllabus, however good, is of little value unless there is really adequate inspection."

I now come to my last quotation, and I must apologise if I have wearied your Lordships. A member of the National Union of Teachers, and a keen promoter of educational progress in all ways, who is in touch with the schools and teachers in a very large borough, says—

"The syllabus of religious instruction is satisfactory, but the way it is carried out is in many cases deplorable as regards both teaching and examining. There are teachers who do not scruple to use their power of teaching the Bible to undermine the children's faith in the Resurrection, and who definitely teach such a view as, *e.g.*, that Jesus Christ was a man who 'thought He was sent by God, and He was not; just as Mahomet thought he was a man sent by God and he was not.' . . . There is not the slightest reason to suppose that any of these would *refuse* to give the Bible lesson, and some welcome it as an opportunity for *denials.* All this takes place in spite of a good syllabus, when there is no assurance that teachers believe what they teach. . . . It is appalling

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

to think what the results of Bible teaching on the minds of our children will be when the influence of Church Schools and Training Colleges has been swept away, and 'no test' religious instruction has become established in all schools alike."

These last two letters have led me a little off the line which I had desired to take. The writers have been expressing opinions. Those opinions may be right or wrong. That is not the point I am pressing to-day. What I want is to show how, as a matter of fact, some council teaching is being regarded by capable and competent men. This fact ought to be in your Lordships' minds when criticising the Return relating to syllabuses. I ask your Lordships to make inquiries on this subject for yourselves and find out what is being done. You will find, for example, that there is a very large number of schools in which under the present authority no Bibles are issued to the children. There is a Bible for the teacher only.

It may, of course, be said that when one has to deal with a large number of people it is always possible to rake together a few unsatisfactory or even scandalous examples. It would be most unfair, it may be said, to condemn Cowper-Temple, or council teaching wholesale on such a ground. I agree; I am doing nothing of the kind. I have not made to-day, nor will I now make, any general observation on the goodness or badness of Cowper-Temple teaching. I am pointing out that these syllabuses do not correspond in fact with what is done, though, of course, the local education authority, perhaps from indifference, is, in many cases, unaware of the fact. I recognise the principle that *de minimis non curat lex.* But I have shown that under the regulations of two-thirds of the local education authorities in England there is no religious inspection for which they take responsibility. Therefore the peril, if it exists at all, is on a scale which cannot be spoken of as insignificant, but calls for careful consideration before we make up our minds about the proposals which are some day to come before us. I ask your Lordships to weigh these facts and tendencies before you make up your minds what decision you will take regarding these proposals.

At present there are in England in round numbers 6,000 provided schools and 14,000 non-provided schools. In connection with the 14,000 non-provided schools there are trust deeds which guarantee that there shall be religious teaching. If it were to cease, or to be neglected, the trustees or managers would, I suppose, be liable to a process of law. We are not going to be asked to say that those schools shall be transferred as regards their religious teaching to the guardianship of authorities as to whom I have shown what is possible. I am not arguing to-day against that transfer, but I urge your Lordships before consenting to it to weigh the facts, so that you may take any step which you take with your eyes open, and not act on the strength of any easy phrase about what is called simple Bible teaching in the schools. In the last few hours a Return has been made relating to the teaching in Church schools. I have not had time to examine it thoroughly, but it seems to show nothing but what I believe to be entirely accurate. The Church schools, 12,000 in number, are all inspected and reported upon. What I call attention to, as our danger in this matter, is this, that, excellent as the teaching exhibited in these Blue-books may be, we have no means of knowing how far it is being practically given.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH: My Lords, may I, in the fewest possible words, give the evidence afforded by Wales, which is in many ways typical and significant? For comparison it may be useful to recall the fact that the Blue-book of 1895 showed that there were 336 school board districts in Wales and Monmouthshire. In 128 of them the Bible was not read, in 140 it was read without comment; that is, in 268 out of 336 school board districts the Bible was not read at all, or read without comment, while in 324 out of 336 there was no examination in religious knowledge.

The Return which has just been issued invites some comments, which I venture to make. I am a member of the Flintshire Education Committee, who did me the honour of electing me as chairman of the sub-committee appointed to draft a syllabus of religious instruction for the provided schools. During last month I have acquired reliable information from every parish in my diocese as to the religious instruction actually given in the provided schools. The religious syllabus unanimously adopted by the sub-committee of which I was chairman was satisfactory, and included for the five upper standards the Apostles' Creed. The sub-committee also resolved that an examination should be made in religious knowledge. The Education Committee adopted the syllabus, with the omission of the Apostles' Creed. This was not pressed to a division, but I have good reason to believe that on a division it would have been carried.

It is my belief that an honest effort has been made in Flintshire to carry out the syllabus, but I must also add that Flintshire stands quite alone in Wales in the conciliatory spirit in which it has dealt with this subject. It is true that there are very few provided schools in Flintshire. My inquiries show that in forty-three out of fifty-three school board districts in the diocese there is no examination in religious knowledge. There are thirty where there is no regular Bible reading, and twenty-three where the Bible is read occasionally or regularly. In my opinion there is a great gap between the syllabus on paper and the syllabus as actually taught in the schools. Even in the schools where religious instruction is professedly given, there is the greatest possible variety in the type and character of the instruction given. In a very few cases it seems to be real and substantial as far as it goes. In the majority of cases it is spasmodic and fragmentary, and in not more than 5 per cent. of the schools in Wales is it of any special value.

I am told by a well-informed correspondent that in the provided schools in his parish the master, on his own responsibility, teaches the children, in his own words, certain parables and miracles from the New Testament. Another informant, equally competent, tells me that the Bible is allowed to be read in the provided schools in his parish without comment; and he adds this fact, which I believe to be not uncommon, that the scripture lesson is given in a perfunctory manner, not 50 per cent. of the children being present. Although the schools rank high for regular attendance, no special effort is made to get the scholars to be present at the scripture lesson. My own experience, and the evidence which reaches me from many quarters, convinces me that local education authorities lack that unity of purpose which is so essential to make religious instruction of any value.

The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.

Much has been said about the work of Sunday schools, especially in Wales. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has already referred to Cardiganshire, in which sixty out of seventy-five schools have no religious instruction. I have consulted the year books of the leading Nonconformist bodies in Wales for 1905 and 1895, and in the county of Cardiganshire the Sunday schools during those ten years show an actual decrease in the number of members; taking the figures for the whole of the body, not only in Wales but in England, their Sunday school membership only shows an increase of 12,000, which is confined to the counties of Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire, where the population during that period increased by 200,000. In the Welsh Nonconformist Sunday schools a very large number, often the majority, of the members are adults, and when you add to the short time given to religious instruction the fact that so many of the teachers are ill-equipped to give instruction, I think it will be seen that the suggestion is a very unreal one that the Sunday schools, even in Wales, adequately provide for the religious instruction of the young.

In all the official defences which I have recently seen of undenominationalism I have not seen it stated that such teaching must, of necessity, include the teaching of the central doctrine of Christianity. In Wales the drift and the tendency of the undenominational mind was graphically illustrated to me by a leading Nonconformist in Wales, when I was urging upon him that Christian teaching without its essential doctrine was of very little value. "Well," he said—"in our teaching we do not use the word Divinity; we only talk of personality." In that substitution lies a grave warning. The arguments in favour of teaching what is called a common Christianity have the appearance of a broad charity which cannot but attract, but when practical work strips these theories of their plausibility, the conclusion is irresistibly borne in upon the mind that it is not the function of the State, even when represented by local education authorities, to determine the religious instruction to be given to the child. If religious instruction is to be of any value, there must be behind it the propelling force of deep conviction, and conviction does not follow on the line of least resistance.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: My Lords, I should like, if I may, to emphasise with all the force I can put into it the truth of the remarks which have fallen from the most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury. The syllabuses which have been published in the Blue-book lately placed in your Lordships' hands may look very well on paper, but syllabuses on paper are one thing and the actual teaching given in the schools alluded to is very often quite another. That is a fact which anyone who has experience of the kind of teaching given in Board schools can verify for himself, and I am quite sure your Lordships could do nothing more useful, in view of the discussion impending next week, than to ascertain what is the kind of teaching actually given in many schools in regard to which the syllabuses look best on paper.

There is another fact which it is very important we should remember. In so far as the undenominational teaching given in Board schools has preserved a sort of Christianity, and by Christianity I mean the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement—in so far as that undenominational teaching has preserved a sort of Christianity, it is largely due to the fact that the teachers in the Board schools have been trained in Church training colleges, and also to the fact that side by side with the Board schools there have existed Church schools which have kept up the whole standard of religious teaching. We know that those two securities are gravely threatened at the present time, and, whatever may be said as to the character of some of the teaching in Board schools in the past, that is no kind of security that under the proposed arrangement the teaching will continue of that character in the future.

You may teach a child to know by heart portions of the Sermon on the Mount; you may teach him many of the facts of Bible history; but do you suppose that because you have done that you have really taught him the essential truths of the Christian religion which will help him to live well and die well? Those who know what religious education is, and how children have to be taught, know perfectly well that that kind of teaching is practically useless when it comes to the crises of life. I am certain it cannot be denied that the undenominational teaching given in Board schools has more and more tended to become simply moral and ethical, and to eliminate those central doctrines of Christianity which constitute the Christian religion, and upon which the welfare of the children and of the State in future entirely depends.

LORD BURGHCLERE: My Lords, it is with considerable hesitation, and not a little diffidence, that I venture to address a few remarks to your Lordships on the subject which has been brought forward by the most rev. Primate; and I should not do so had I not a suggestion to make which I venture to think is relevant, and which I should like, with all submission, to propose to your Lordships.

My suggestion was prompted partly by the wise and moderate speech of the most rev. Primate, and partly by the remark which fell from the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of St. Asaph who followed him. With regard to inspection I would point out to the most rev. Primate that in one area at any rate in Lincolnshire, to which he referred, some of the school managers arrange for an examination to be conducted by the inspector for religious instruction of the Lincoln Diocesan Board, and that, I think, would be an inspection satisfactory to the Episcopal Bench. I find in this Blue-book that in another case inspection has been arranged for by three members of the Church of England and three Nonconformists. That seems to me a mode of inspection, with regard to such a syllabus as probably existed in those schools, which might be of advantage.

But the suggestion which I rise to make to your Lordships is simply this. I think it will be admitted on all hands, that if there is one truth that has come out from all our debates on this vexed education question it is this, that the people of England—and when I speak of the people of England I do not adopt the usual practice of referring to those of my own Party, but to the people of England almost unanimously—are determined that in our national education, enforced upon our people and paid for by the State, there shall be some form of religious education in the elementary schools; and I venture to think that when they say religious education they mean Christian education. If that be so, surely the time has come when moderate men might consider whether it would not be possible to formulate a syllabus drawn up on authority which would be universally accepted.

As we know, in the past there have been syllabuses circulated by the London School Board which received the adhesion of the Church of England and all the Free Churches. If that could be done in a population of one-sixth of the country, can it not be extended to cover all the elementary schools of the country? The two Returns which we have had on this subject on the Motion of the most rev. Primate, rather leads me to hope that such a solution will be possible. Part I. of the Return is the only one which I have been able to study exhaustively, because the other only appeared yesterday; but it strikes me, from the examination I have been able to give to these syllabuses, that one thing undoubtedly comes out. The vast majority of the syllabuses issued by the local education authorities bear a striking resemblance to each other in their main principle, and not one contains anything which contradicts any denominational teaching which may hereafter be thought necessary.

These syllabuses contain almost invariably the whole of the historical portions of the Old and New Testament. They contain the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, and the parables and miracles in the New Testament. I have not had the advantage of seeing the Return of the demoninational syllabuses, but I have seen the syllabus issued by the National Society, which institution, as your Lordships know, was originally instituted in order to teach the children of the poor the principles of the Church of England. There are differences between that syllabus and the syllabuses issued by the local education authorities, but anyone who examines them will be struck by the extraordinary similarity in many portions. In the syllabus issued by the National Society I find these words—

> "The teacher is reminded that a thorough knowledge of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments will be of the highest value to the child in after life."

That seems to me to be the essential ground work on which the Christian education should be built up. It seems to me that it would be possible to appoint a body of Churchmen and Nonconformists who would draw up a syllabus acceptable to both parties, and which might be universally adopted and so settle sectarian divisions in national education.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I feel this is a very difficult subject to enter upon, and difficult to speak upon without going beyond the limits of the speech of the most rev. Primate. I know that it would be irregular if we were to enter into the matters which will be before us for debate next week or in the Autumn, and that the question before us to-day is that raised by the most rev. Primate. The main drift of his speech was that, whatever the value of schemes of religious instruction drawn up by local education authorities may be, that value was *nil*, or at any rate, very small indeed, unless steps were taken to follow it up by careful inspection to test if the education was efficiently given.

I cannot help thinking that the speech of the most rev. Primate may have suggested to some persons whether it might not be the duty of Parliament to interfere in this matter in order to secure an adequate system of religious teaching in our schools. It is on that point that I wish to enter a very serious word of caution. Some people may be inclined to contradict me when I say that there never has been State inspection of religious teaching in any school. It is quite true that before the Act of 1870 His Majesty's inspector of Church schools did also inspect the religious teaching, but at that time there was a very curious dual control. Every inspector of Church schools was a clergyman, and he held a dual appointment, one from the Crown and one from the two Archbishops; and his work as inspector of religious knowledge was performed under that other condition and not as an officer of the Government. It will be remembered that in passing the Act of

1870, Mr. Gladstone, who certainly felt as strongly on this question of religious teaching as anybody, thought it necessary that the State should be absolutely cut off from all participation in interference with, or supervision of religious teaching.

I think it would be very unfortunate to attempt to involve the State in the setting up of a new State Church. Any interference by the State, if it came into existence at all, would have to be on broad lines, and not in connection with any particular section of the Christian community of this country. But what is the security for religious teaching in our schools? The security must be the amount of interest that the people who elect the county councils and the education authorities take in it. If the religious instruction that is given is not efficient, the remedy is for the persons who feel that the work is not being done efficiently to elect people who will represent their opinions more faithfully. But if it is considered that the slackness described by the most rev. Primate is slackness arising from the indifference of the community, I am afraid there can be no remedy. Nobody supposes that a clause in an Act of Parliament would press on local opinion a higher desire for definite teaching such as the noble Viscount who has just sat down pleaded for.

The most rev. Primate told us that, according to the figures in his possession, not more than one-third of the local authorities had inspection, and that therefore as to two-thirds you had no security that the teaching was well given. But I think the most rev. Primate would have done better if, instead of merely counting the number of local authorities, he had paid some attention to the quantity of persons residing in the areas of those local authorities. We often hear very delusive statements put forward to the effect that there are 13,000 or 14,000 National schools, and only 5,000 or 6,000 Board schools. The proper way of looking at the facts is to ask what are the number of scholars being taught in those schools; and in this case the question to be asked is as to the number of people inhabiting the particular districts.

The National Society has issued an analysis of Part I. of these Returns, and I would call attention to the appendix, in which they indicate the arrangements made for the inspection of religious instruction by authorities who have determined to have religious teaching. Running my eye down the English counties I find that fifteen of them have inspection and seven have none. I look at the counties which have inspection and find that they include such populous counties as Durham and the three Ridings of Yorkshire. In Wales I find that the only county which is put down as having no inspection is Carmarthenshire. Flintshire, Glamorganshire, and Merionethshire have inspection. The right rev. Prelate may say that the inspection of those counties is inefficient.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH: I was referring not to inspection but to examination, which is a different thing.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: For years there has been a sense of extreme resentment on the part of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses of Church schools against systematic examination as distinct from inspection; resentment against making religious teaching in those schools a matter of examination like ordinary secular teaching. I think the vital principle we ought to be reminded of is that it is not either wise or justifiable for the State to interfere by prescribing how that religious education should be given. I am sure the most rev. Primate is well acquainted with the bound-up records of the various diocesan inspectors of religious knowledge under the National Society. It will be seen from this volume that in many counties many of the small rural school boards take advantage of the services of the diocesan inspectors, and you will see in many reports testimony by the inspector, not merely to the way in which the work was done, but also to the reverent, earnest, thorough way in which the instruction was given, and to the cordial manner in which he was welcomed. Therefore, while it is the fashion nowadays to run down these small village school boards, it must be remembered that many of them are doing very good and serious work.

Many years ago I was a member of Lord Cross's Commission upon Elementary Education, and the Commission took great pains to ascertain the value and thoroughness of the religious teaching in voluntary schools. In 3,600 such schools, it was found, from information supplied by managers, that the register of attendance was not generally marked until after the religious teaching was given, and also that in a third of those schools—and a large proportion were Church schools—it was the practice to allow the time apportioned to religious teaching to be encroached upon when preparation for Government inspection was going on. Yet those schools were for the most part under diocesan inspection, and their managers were deeply impressed with the importance of religious teaching. I mention this to show that it is useless to attempt by outside pressure to carry this teaching further than local feeling is prepared to go. The most rev. Primate has raised a very delicate question, and the circumstances are embarrassing from the desire to keep clear of a discussion that must arise a few days hence.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK: My Lords, the speech of the noble Lord to which we have just listened is but a supplement to that of the most rev. Primate. The Archbishop's object is to show the difference between what is nominally and what is actually done. The noble Lord has argued that it is undesirable to attempt by administrative pressure to make local authorities do more in this direction than they are willing to do. The most rev. Primate was not driving at any such conclusion. What he did suggest was that where there were schools in which there was some security you should hesitate before bringing them under a system where the security for religious teaching was doubtful, and in which it was impossible to strengthen that security. Churchmen have always endeavoured to influence local authorities in favour of religious teaching in the schools, and the results that have followed are recorded. I rejoice to believe that it is true that generally English opinion is in favour of making religion the basis of education, but I think that any person who takes up the instructions of local authorities to their teachers, and, regardless of his own opinions, asked—" Is there security for the teaching of Christianity as broadly understood ?" will be bound to admit that there is not. I could give instances which would show that the instructions convey no security for the teaching of fundamental Christian truths though they lend themselves to and often lead to the substitution of edifying moral instruction.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I think it cannot be disputed that the subject which has been brought before the House to-night by the most rev. Primate yields in importance to none that has been brought forward during the present session. Quite apart from any extension which may take place under circumstances which have not yet been officially brought to your Lordships' knowledge, this teaching which is under discussion to-night applies to over 6,000 of the public elementary schools of the country, in which upwards of two million and a half children are educated. Those children are the citizens of the future. They are the future parents of our race, and I think it cannot be disputed that the question whether their moral and religious teaching is of the kind which your Lordships would wish them to have, or whether it is not merely, as some think, hostile to the Church of England, but as its most distinguished opponent has stated, in its effect ultimately subversive of the elements of Christianity, is in itself a question of importance.

To my mind, this is a more important question than any which has been brought before your Lordships this year. It is more important than the reduction of certain battalions in His Majesty's Army, or the question of the output of gold in South Africa. The most rev. Primate brought the matter before the House in a speech which, as we should have expected from him, was one of great moderation, and was also marked by courtesy towards the Department which I represent and towards myself, for which I desire to thank him. One kind of criticism which fell, not so much from the right rev. Primate as from other speakers who followed him, is, I confess, somewhat difficult to meet. It is said, " Here are these syllabuses which you have presented to Parliament. They are all very fine, and at first sight are exceedingly attractive. But what guarantee have we that they in any way, or to any real extent, represent the teaching which is actually given in the schools." That is a difficult argument to meet, because, if there is much in it, it has the effect of making the Return which has been obtained at some considerable trouble and expense really valueless; and one is tempted to ask, if that is the conclusion at which we are to arrive, why the Return was ever asked for at all?

What is the teaching which is given in these schools? It is given under one part of Section 14 of the Act of 1870, which during all these thirty-six years has retained its old House of Commons nickname of the Cowper-Temple clause. That section provides that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the schools. That section prescribes nothing and enjoins nothing. It is purely negative in its effects. Its limits are perfectly familiar to many of your Lordships. It has been agreed that the Apostles' Creed, which in one sense might be considered a formulary, may be taught because it is not distinctive of any particular denomination. On the other hand, it is also agreed that those parts of the catechism of the Church of England which are not in themselves denominational, and which, so far as their doctrine is concerned, would be accepted by many who do not belong to the Church of England, must not be taught because they do form part of a formulary distinctive of the Church of England. As we know, there is no compulsion under this section to give any religious education at all, and there are in England, out of 6,000 odd schools, thirteen in which, according to this Return, no religious instruction is given. As to Wales, I will say a word later. But where it is given it may be given according to two entirely distinct conceptions.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: Would the noble Earl kindly repeat the last statistics he gave?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I said that thirteen schools out of the total gave no religious instruction.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: Individual schools are not given in this Return. Perhaps the noble Earl means "authorities."

*THE EARL OF CREWE: If the most rev. Primate will look at the Return he will see that in some cases at the close certain authorities have stated the number of schools in which no instruction is given, and the total number is, I think, thirteen. I was saying that religious teaching, Bible teaching as it is called, may be given, and is given, according to two entirely distinct conceptions. It may be given, and in some cases is given, as moral teaching, ethical teaching, philosophical teaching, if you like to call it so, the Bible being chosen in preference to extracts from other ethical works, either works of ancient philosophy or books which are regarded as sacred by other religions, because it is held that both in its ethical teaching and by the beauty of its language, it is the most appropriate means of conveying moral truths to the minds of children. It is there given with a view of inculcating what is called citizenship—an admirable thing, although I think to some extent in this particular connection the word has acquired an almost cant use.

On the other hand, this simple Bible instruction may be given, and in a very large number of institutions is given, as expressing in a form most suited to the minds of children the elements of the Christian faith, and, as my noble friend Lord Burghclere very truly pointed out, expressing them in terms which does not makes it impossible for them to be supplemented either in the home, in the Sunday school, or out of school hours on other days by special teaching distinctive of a particular denomination. I think it cannot be disputed, when these syllabuses are closely examined with the kind of attention which the most reverend Primate has given to them, that in the very great majority of cases it is in the latter spirit, in the spirit of teaching the real elements of Christianity, that the authorities intend this teaching to be given in their schools. There are, as the most reverend Primate has pointed out, a considerable number of authorities who have issued no syllabus at all, and the right rev. Primate placed upon that fact the construction that the issuing or the not issuing of a syllabus depended upon the accident of certain persons who took a deep interest in this matter being upon the authority. I am not quite certain that that is the correct explanation. I think the more probable explanation is that certain authorities have thought it more desirable that option should be left to the locality served by the particular school.

The most rev. Primate seemed to think that in all such cases it was left to the option of the teacher whether such teaching should be given. He forgets that in many cases the managers of the schools are those to whom this option is left, and it is assumed that that option is exercised in accordance with the wishes of the locality. As a typical instance of what I mean when I say that I believe that in the great majority of cases the local authorities desire to see this teaching not merely moral but essentially Christian, I will read an extract from the ably-drawn instructions issued by the County Council of the North Riding of Yorkshire. They say—

> "In Council Schools they regard it as their duty to see that moral instruction is given, and given through, and in accordance with, the teaching of the simplest form of the Christian faith. It is to be understood that in accepting service under the Education Committee of the North Riding, the teacher accepts this responsibillty, and that his conscientious willingness to give such teaching is implied. In the moral training given in a good school there are two factors, the daily life of practice and example and the definite religious teaching. The daily life of the school may be, and often is, a real and practical education in honesty, unselfishness, industry and reverence for all that is good. The religious teaching must be such as primarily and at once may inspire this daily training with the Christian spirit, and secondly may attach the children in their future lives to the principles of Christian truth. According as it tends to attain these two objects, the religious instruction given in our schools justifies its existence."

The instructions go on to say—

> "As early as possible, the text of the Bible itself must be used. Paraphrase and 'Scripture Histories' are to be avoided. The style of the Bible and its substance are inseparable, and the language of our version is a national inheritance. Criticism, and even the suggestion of difficulty, are utterly out of place in teaching children: what is of importance is so to teach that they may in the future have nothing to unlearn, and that the foundations of their faith may be laid on those eternal truths which are beyond the reach of criticism of unimportant details. Their attention should be directed to the greatest and most vital truths in the Bible, to the Power, the Justice and the Love of God, the duty of His people, the great deeds and thoughts of His faithful servants as set forth in the Old Testament, and to the Life, the Acts and the Words of Christ and of His Apostles in the New Testament."

That is one instance of the instructions, as I think, admirably drawn, which in my opinion reflects the general impression left on one's mind by a perusal of these syllabuses as to the intention of the local authorities, speaking generally, as to religious teaching in council schools. I may also say that I have been stuck by the fact, which I confess was not familiar to me, that the collects from the liturgy of the Church of England, and also the hymns which are in use in church hymn-books, are used by a great many of these authorities. That, I think, does tend to show that it is more than an exaggeration—an actual misstatement—to speak of this teaching as being as a general rule in any sense hostile to the Church of England.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I did not say it was.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am quite aware that the most reverend Primate did not say so, but it has very often been said, and has been said by some of the most distinguished opponents of this kind of teaching; and the same observation, I think, applies to the description of this kind of teaching as involving a new religion. A misstatement is never so completely a misstatement as when it tries to sound like an epigram, and in this particular case one can only point to this thick volume of 600 pages as offering in itself an absolute denial of that statement, because there is no sign, so far as one can see, of any general desire to do anything but teach, in their simplest form, the truths which, although I know some deny it, form a sort of common denominator of Christianity. I confess that, after studying this book with great care, I have reached the conclusion that in the vast majority of cases the local authorities do regard this teaching, and the parents of the children must also therefore regard this teaching, as pointing the way, not to the porch of philosophy, of which, indeed, most of the parents have never heard, but to the simple services of the churches and chapels in which they and their fathers have been used to worship.

Let me deal for one moment with the objections that have been taken, both in and out of your Lordships' House, with regard to this teaching. Of course we know that there is a considerable body of opinion in this country, including all members of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Jewish community, and also a certain proportion—a proportion which I cannot attempt to estimate—of the Church of England, who regard this teaching as not merely incomplete, but radically erroneous and wrong. That view has been expressed with great force by one for whose opinion on any subject the country has a great regard—I mean Lord Hugh Cecil. Lord Hugh Cecil brings to bear upon the discussion of any subject a mind of the most brilliant acuteness and also of the most transparent sincerity. His absence from the present House of Commons has been, I am sure, regretted by all his political opponents, and I have no doubt equally by all those of his political allies who did not combine in trying to keep him out of that assembly. Lord Hugh Cecil stated in a letter written on the 16th of this month that the Church of England regards the tendency of the operations of the Cowper-Temple clause as hostile to her teaching and ultimately subversive of Christianity. I have no intention—and if I had the intention I should not have the ability—to enter into a theological controversy with my noble friend; but everything which he says carries so much weight that I cannot help recording that I am fairly puzzled by the arguments which he brings forward in support of his contention. His belief is that the tendency of this teaching, although he fully admits that in some cases it may be given in a satisfactory manner, is to destroy the two central doctrines of the Christian Church—namely, the belief in sin and the belief in grace. As I said, I am not going to enter into any theological argument; but I think it is pertinent to remark this much, that belief in these doctrines has formed a central part of that thread of Puritan faith which was conspicuous in England at the end of the sixteenth and during the seventeenth century, which survived the indifference of the eighteenth century and the Tractarian revival in the last century, and which is now represented in a great measure by the Nonconformist bodies and also by the Evangelical section of the Church of England

Why I mention this point is this, that we are apt to be told here—I expect to be told before the House adjourns for the summer—that this teaching given in the council schools is of a kind which is thoroughly satisfactory and suitable to all Nonconformists. All I can say is that if its effect is such as Lord Hugh Cecil supposes, the entire bottom is knocked out of that argument, because if its effect is to deny or to attempt to depreciate those central doctrines of the Christian Church, it certainly must be as unsuited and as unpalatable to the Nonconformist Churches as it can possibly be to the Church of England.

The most rev. Primate made one or two criticisms upon the manner in which this syllabus teaching is carried out in the council schools, and he devoted himself very largely to the question of inspection. I entirely agree with the most rev. Primate that it is exceedingly desirable that such teaching should be thoroughly inspected with a view to the maintenance of its efficiency. I think, however, that in some respects he slightly overstated his case. I do not think it is quite fair to assume that all uninspected teaching is necessarily bad, although that was rather the inference which I confess I drew from the most rev. Primate's speech. I should like just to say this. We do find that in a great many cases authorities are glad to admit outside inspection, conducted sometimes by clergymen and by Nonconformist ministers together, and sometimes by them in alternate years; and I should like to know whether it is the case that in a great many of these uninspected areas either the clergy of the Church of England or Nonconformist ministers have in any way volunteered their services for this purpose, and how far they have been refused. For there is a distinction, I think, which ought to be drawn between an authority which, being engaged in other matters, may not have thought this question over very carefully and, therefore, not instituted any system of inspection, and an authority which, when voluntary inspection is offered to it, refuses it for reasons of its own. That, I think, is a distinction which ought to be very carefully drawn.

The most rev. Primate read some very interesting documents, and nothing, as we should, of course, have expected, could have been fairer than the manner in which he declined to lay too great stress on the individual instances of hardship or misbehaviour which he adduced. It is, of course, very difficult to draw any conclusions from quotations of that kind. The most rev. Primate mentioned one case where the clergyman had no influence whatever on the local education authority. I do not know what the authority was, neither do I know who the clergyman was, and unless any of us had the opportunity of knowing what the actual circumstances were it would be very hard to say with whom the fault lay. There may have been, as there very often are in such cases, faults on both sides. In the same way, the only extract which I rather regret that the most rev. Primate read, was that about the agnostic teacher, who seems to have taken a somewhat prominent, and, I venture to think, a very improper part, by writing letters to the newspapers about his personal views. There are undoubtedly a few such people, and the most rev. Primate warned us, mostly fairly and most carefully, against attempting to lay down any rule from a single instance of that kind.

I do think there is just one further point to be mentioned with regard to inspection. I believe it is tending to increase, and your Lordships who have had time to look at the Return will see that a certain number of authorities are considering the question with a view to arriving at some satisfactory conclusion in the matter. I associate myself entirely with what fell from my noble friend Lord Stanley, to the effect that it really is upon public opinion that you must finally depend for the maintenance of the religious character of your schools. If the people of this country, speaking generally, regard Christianity, not as a system of excellent rules of conduct, but as a living faith, that fact will be reflected in the education given in the public elementary schools of this country; but if that ceases to be the case, if the general tendency of the country is towards regarding the Christian faith rather as an ethical system than as a faith, I do not see how it is possible that the fact can fail sooner or later to be reflected in your schools.

The Earl of Crewe.

The prevention of that result, which we should all deplore, must be the work of the Churches, and of the Churches alone. I am tempted to quote, on this point, some remarks which were made in a letter by the Dean of Carlisle, published in *The Times* of February 6 of this year. Speaking of this teaching the Dean said—

> "Can we forget, or refuse to take into consideration, the fact that for many years in London between two-thirds and three-fourths of the children have attended Board Schools and have been brought up under this system? With what result? Has the Church lost her influence over those so brought up or those who are still at school? Are we really to believe that the Church is weaker in those districts where Church day schools are in a hopeless minority than in the districts where Church schools hold their own? And if this is not the case, is it not because in the present day, as in the past, the real lasting work of attaching the children to the Church of their baptism is not brought about so much by the influence of the day-school as by the splendid work which is being done in so many parishes among the children outside the day-schools, by children's services, Sunday and Saturday schools, guilds, clubs, brigades, and numberless other organisations by which the children are laid hold and kept hold of as they grow in years?"

That seems to me a very pregnant and far-reaching statement. As I think your Lordships will have gathered from what I have said, I am very far from undervaluing the religious teaching which can be given in schools, but I do think it is upon those other agencies you have to depend if you wish to maintain the genuinely Christian character of this country.

I will only say one word about Wales. According to this Return there are 162 schools, of which sixty-two are in Carmarthenshire and sixty-six in Cardiganshire, where no religious education is given; and the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of St. Asaph was at pains to show that the Sunday school teaching, which is generally stated to act in Wales as a substitute for teaching of this kind, was by no means a complete substitute for it. I cannot profess to speak with the local knowledge of the right rev. Prelate, but I do believe it to be the fact—and I do not think it will be disputed by the right rev. Prelate or by anybody who knows Wales—that it is not what in the case of great towns would be spoken of as irreligion which leads to this result. It may be true—I am not competent to say—that the tendency of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism is more in the direction of Unitarianism than it has been in the past; but, if that is so, undoubtedly those who profess that form of religion will have their children brought up in accordance with the tenets which they themselves believe. I do not think it would be fair to label that part of Wales to which this Return applies as irreligious in consequence of this fact.

I am assured by those competent to speak that as a matter of fact the children in those very districts where no religious education is given in the schools are, as a matter of fact, well acquainted with the Bible and with the general elements of the Christian faith. The Sunday school system of Wales is, of course, a very special and peculiar one. As the right rev. Prelate said, the Sunday schools there are attended largely by grown-up people, but, in spite of that fact, I do not know that there is any evidence that in Wales anything like what could be called a wave of irreligion is sweeping over the country in consequence of the action of the local authorities in this matter.

I most fully admit that this debate which might very easily have trenched on markedly controversial ground, has, through the care of those who have taken part in it, been kept very free from matters concerned with any measure now before Parliament which has not reached this House. Personally, I may say that I am very glad this discussion has taken place. I think it has certainly tended to clear the air in regard to this particular subject, and I think that when the time comes for us to go more deeply into the whole question we shall find that this discussion has been of very real service to us.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: As a personal matter, may I refer to one point upon which in the course of his speech I interrupted the noble Earl? I understood him to say that there were only thirteen schools in England in which no religious instruction was given. I imagine the noble Earl to have been referring to the answers to Question No. 5—that is to say, where the local authorities state that that is so. But I turn to one almost by accident—Huddersfield, and there I find that—

> "In schools provided by the Board no religious instruction shall be given, but a period not exceeding fifteen minutes shall be devoted at the beginning of each morning meeting . . .'

to certain religious exercises. There are seventeen board schools in Huddersfield alone.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am sorry that my figures were not quite clear on that point.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I am sure the noble Earl would not intentionally mislead anyone, but the thirteen would require a great deal of modification.

MR. WATTS' STATUE "PHYSICAL ENERGY."

*THE EARL OF PLYMOUTH rose to ask His Majesty's Government whether a site has definitely been selected for the bronze statue called "Physical Energy," by the late Mr. G. F. Watts, R.A., and, if so, what the position of the site is. He said: In putting to my noble friend the Question which stands in my name on the Paper, I should like to say a word or two in explanation, and to remind the House of the circumstances under which this gift was first of all made to the nation. At that time—I think it was six or seven years ago—the late Mr. Watts offered to the nation a bronze copy of his equestrian group called "Physical Energy," subject to a site being provided for it. The then Government accepted the offer with gratitude, and consulted, as far as my recollection goes, not a committee, but certain gentlemen of well known reputation in matters of general taste. It was, I believe, then suggested that a site on the dam on the Serpentine should be chosen for the statue. Nothing more was heard of the matter for a few years; the late Mr. Watts desired to work further on his plaster model, and was not ready to cast the statue. But when I saw him some six months before he died, he told me that it was just as much his intention as it had ever been to present this bronze group to the nation, and he hoped very shortly to have it cast. His death unfortunately occurred and prevented him from carrying out his intention. Mrs. Watts, however, placed the plaster model at the disposal of the Government, and in last year's Estimates £2,000 were voted by Parliament to have the cast made.

I only wish now to ask my noble friend—and I believe he will be able to give me the reply I hope to receive—whether the site which was indicated some years ago is the one now selected for the statue. I think it was generally felt when a bronze cast of the statue was exhibited a year ago in the courtyard of Burlington House that the least favourable view of it was that obtained as you approached it in front. This site on the dam of the Serpentine seems exceedingly suitable, because you would be unable to approach the statue from the front unless you hired a boat on the Serpentine. I know that a question was raised as to whether the foundations were sufficiently secure to enable a heavy bronze statue to be put upon them; I trust that the noble Lord will be able to tell me that that difficulty does not now exist. I would, however, venture to make this suggestion. It appeared to me that the best way of making a pedestal for this statue was to project it, in a semi-circular form perhaps, beyond the balustrade which now exists, into the water, thus taking it away from the actual line of the path and setting it out in the Serpentine. Whether there are insuperable difficulties to this I do not know, but I hope that the idea will not be lost sight of, and that it will be found possible to put the statue in such a position.

*THE LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of LIVERPOOL): In answer to my noble friend I am very happy to be able to tell him that a site has been definitely selected at the east end of the Serpentine, and I am glad to have my belief confirmed that that is the site originally intended and selected by him. As to whether the dam is strong enough to bear the weight, I am afraid I cannot answer that off-hand, but I conclude that all such questions have been inquired into by the Office of Works. With regard to the noble Earl's suggestion as to a sort of bastion being made, projecting into the water, upon which to place the statue, I will take care that that is laid before the Office of Works.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 26th July, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Crediton Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill [Lords]. Read the third time and passed, with an Amendment.

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Truro Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

Paisley Roads Order Confirmation Bill, "to confirm a Provisional Order under

The Private Legislation Procedure Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley Roads," presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered (under Section 7 of the Act), to be considered To-morrow.

Dover Harbour (Works) Bill [Lords].

The Chairman of Ways and Means, in pursuance of Standing Order 83 relating to Private Bills, informed the House that, in his opinion, the Dover Harbour (Works) Bill [Lords], though unopposed, ought to be treated as an opposed Bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill; North West London Railway Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [Lords]; Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. EMMOTT, Oldham) stated that it was inadvisable to make the practice of carrying over private Bills to the Autumn sittings a regular one. He desired to explain that it was only in one or two cases, on special grounds, that he had allowed such a Bill to go over.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Blithfield; Bumpstead (two): Coopersale; Cropwell Bishop; Ilkeston; Sculcoates; and, Worksop; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; From Cheam; Shefford (two); and, Stondon Massey; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petition from Ealing, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT (No. 3, 1906).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the attack on British Officers at Denshawai [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-eighth Report of the General Prisons Board (Ireland) for 1905–6 with an Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Nelson and confirmed, with certain Amendments, by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table,

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT, 1890.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered April 11th; *Mr. Brodie*]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Acts relating to Sea Fisheries for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Dungannon National School.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the plans and specifications of new national schools, to replace existing condemned buildings in John Street, Dungannon, which have been approved by the Commissioners of National Education, have been before the Board of Works since May 1905; and whether, in view of the urgency of the matter, he will make representations to the Board of Works so as to facilitate the building of the new schools.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The case of this school is involved in the general question of the revision of the standard plans for national school buildings in Ireland. On the general question I have nothing to add to the several answers I have already given.

Belfast Postmen and July 12th.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the Belfast Corporation and Chamber of Commerce have endorsed the request of postmen of the observance of the local holiday, July 12th; and whether, in view of the fact that the greater portion of the correspondence taken out by the postmen on this day is returned as undelivered, and that no inconvenience would be caused to the general public, he will grant this request.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I was aware of all the circumstances of the case when I decided that I could not grant the request.

Hampstead Telephones.

LIEUTENANT - COLONEL PHILIPPS (Southampton); To ask the Postmaster-General how many telephone lines or wires there are between the Victoria Exchange and the post Office, Hampstead, Exchange; and what steps, if any he is taking to increase this number so as to provide the public with an adequate telephone service between these two parts of the metropolis.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There are four direct junction line. between the Victoria and Hampstead post office exchanges. The traffic on these lines is kept under close observation, and there seems no present necessity for additional lines. If the hon. and gallant Member will furnish particulars of any difficulty in communication between these exchanges which may have come to his notice, I shall be glad to have an investigation made, and to provide additional lines if necessary.

Rosyth.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Admiralty if he will announce his policy about Rosyth when making his statement on Friday next.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) I have nothing to add to my reply to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs on July 2nd.†

Ely Estate, Fermanagh.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any agreement for the sale of the Ely estate, in the county of Fermanagh, has been lodged with the Estates Commissioners; and, if not, will he represent to the Estates Commissioners the desirability of their making an effort to purchase this large estate and give the tenants the benefits intended for them by The Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that no agreements for the sale of the estate referred to have been lodged with them. If either the owner or the tenants should approach the Commissioners they will have inquiries made and give the matter due consideration.

Mr. Peter J. O'Malley, J. P.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any representations have been made to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland with reference to the conduct upon the bench of Mr. Peter J. O'Malley, the chairman of the Oughterard District

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1401.

Council, and a Magistrate of the county of Galway; and whether any action is to be taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have referred this Question to the Lord Chancellor's department, and am informed that there is no record of any complaint having been made to the Lord Chancellor as to Mr. O'Malley's conduct as a magistrate.

School Grants in Ireland.

COLONEL McCALMONT (Antrim, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when grants which in many cases have been approved and promised for building schools under the Board of Education in Ireland, but which have since been suspended, will be made, education in populous districts being consequently greatly retarded.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he is aware that materials for the building of two schools near Ferns, in county Wexford, have been collected and on the ground for four years, and that owing to the delay in issuing the loan to build these schools, the work of erecting them has not yet been proceeded with; and inasmuch as these schools are very urgently required, he will use his best efforts to end the extraordinary difficulty that has arisen before this building season is also lost.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I will at the same time answer the Question (No. 85) of the hon. Baronet the Member for Wexford. The Irish Government have been using every effort to bring about a prompt settlement of this important matter, and as it has now been arranged that an increased building grant for next year shall be given, I trust that the work of building and repairing schools may begin and proceed without further delay.

Lord Gough's Gort Property.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state what is the result of the negotiations entered into some time ago between Lord Gough, Chargé d'Affairs at Dresden, and the Estates Commissioners in respect to the sale of his Gort property.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are not yet in a position to state the result of the negotiations in this case.

Kinvara Harbour.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland having regard to the fact that the County Council of Galway are most anxious and prepared to do everything in their power to carry out the improvement scheme projected by the Board of Works, the Congested Districts Board, and the Agricultural Board, for the extension of the pier and the general improvement of Kinvara Harbour, county Galway, whether the Irish Government propose to take any steps with a view of starting the works at once.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to my reply to his Question upon the subject on the 9th inst.† The Government are advised that legislation is necessary to empower the county council to contribute the proposed amount in this case. The Government are prepared to introduce the necessary legislation, but in the present state of public business it is scarcely possible to hope that the matter can be carried through without delay.

Loughrea Caretaker's Trouble.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to a scuffle which took place quite recently between the police and an emergency man, at present engaged as a caretaker in Martin Ward's House, Loughrea; whether he is aware that Niland, the emergency man, drew a six-chamber revolver at the police who were protecting him, on the night of the 16th July; and what steps do the authorities propose to take for the purpose of protecting both the police and the people against the indiscriminate handling of firearms by such emergency men as Niland.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that on the night of 16th instant the caretaker,

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 531, 532.

Niland, who was somewhat under the influence of drink and but partially dressed, attempted to leave the house, but was prevented by the police who were protecting him. He then took a revolver from his pocket and began to load it, but did not present it at the policemen, or make any threat to use it against them. The policemen, however, thought it necessary to take the revolver from him, and have since retained it in their possession. The police have been directed to report the circumstances to Niland's employer. The question of revoking Niland's licence to possess arms is being considered.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any official information showing that a horse belonging to an emergency man named Niland, living at Craughwell, and doing duty at present as an emergency man for Lord Clanricarde at Loughrea, was maimed at Craughwell on Sunday night last; is Niland under police protection, day and night, without interruption; how many policemen were guarding both himself and his stable, where the horse was confined, on the night of the 15th July, when the outrage is alleged to have been committed; and have the police made any report regarding the part which they suspect Niland played in the transaction.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that on the night of the 15th instant Niland's horse was cut in five places on the legs. Niland, who receives constant police protection, was at his house on that night. Two policemen were at the house for part of the night, and one for the remainder of the night. The police have so far failed to discover the perpetrator of this outrage. It is safer to make no statements regarding any suspicions entertained. When suspicions begin to pass into certainty, the time for stating them will have approached.

Colonel Gascoigne's Kilfinane Property.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have as yet opened negotiations for sale and purchase between Colonel Gascoigne and his town tenants in Kilfinane, county Limerick; and, if not, will he take measures that the Estates Commissioners will approach the landlord so as to bring about the much desired result.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners have given directions that when Colonel Gascoigne's property comes to be inspected, in order of priority, the inspector shall inquire and report upon the application of the Kilfinane town tenants to be included in the sale. The Commissioners do not propose to move in the matter until they have received their inspector's report.

Mr. Lowe's Galbally Tenantry.

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what progress has been made as to sale and purchase between Mr. Lowe and his tenants in Galbally and around it, and have negotiations between the landlord and the town tenants in occupation for sale and purchase been as yet instituted in Lowe's Town, Galbally; and, if not, will he recommend the Estates Commissioners to approach the landlord with the view of facilitating the sales to the occupying tenants and regulating the compensation to be paid to the middlemen.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that thirty-eight purchase agreements in respect of holdings on this estate have been lodged with them, namely, seventeen in June, 1905, and twenty-one in January, 1906. The inspection will take place in order of priority, but the case will not be reached for a considerable time yet. The question of the sale of the village holdings in Lowestown will be considered by the Commissioners after inspection has taken place. The Commissioners have no information as to any negotiations which may have taken place between the landlord and the village tenants in Lowestown.

Minshun Estate, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that the owners of the Minshun, formerly the Frend, Estate around Cahirconlish, county Limerick, have arranged with the tenants for sale to them of their holding; is he aware that on part of this estate there are a few hundred acres of untenanted land let from time to time on the eleven months grazing system; and will he take steps to see that the Estates Commissioners shall approach Mrs. Minshun and the others concerned in the sale with the view of purchasing those untenanted lands for the benefit of the labourers, the evicted tenants, and poor farmers' sons in the locality.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that proceedings for the sale of the estate referred to have not come before them, and they have no knowledge of any arrangement for sale to the tenants. If particulars of the estate, with the name and address of the landlord or his agent, should be furnished to the Commissioners, they will have inquiries made into the matter.

Mountshannon Estate, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say whether in the parcelling out of the Mountshannon estate, in the county Limerick, the claims of Simon Ryan, of Cross, Pallasgrean, James Conway, of Gurtavalla Doon, Hanora Rafferty, formerly of Garrison Pallasgrean, now of Knockroe, Kilteely, and Hanora Lonergan, of Toomaline Doon, evicted tenants, have been recognised, and have applotments of the estate as yet been made, and how do matters stand generally between Mrs. Nevin, the Estates Commissioners, and the evicted tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that their proposal to purchase this estate has been accepted, and they will come into possession on 1st May, 1907. In the meantime the tenants cannot be put into possession nor can the untenanted lands be distributed. A scheme for the allotment of the untenanted land has not yet been settled, but when dealing with the matter the Commissioners will consider the applications of the persons named in the Question, as well as other persons who have applied.

Irish Prison Governors.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland who recommended Majors O'Lewis and Luscombe for positions of deputy-governors and afterwards second-class governors in the Irish Prison Service; what experience had they of prison management to qualify them for these positions; what are the names and length of service of governors qualified to fill these positions who were passed over; on what grounds and on whose recommendation was Clerk Boland appointed deputy-governor of Mountjoy Prison; what are his qualifications and his experience; why were the local deputy-governors who had prior claims overlooked; what was Mr. Boland's salary as clerk and what is his present salary; will he explain why the position of storekeeper was given to a sergeant of the Clare Militia with a few months experience in preference to officers of long service and experience; were there any military applicants for the position of deputy-governor; and, if so, how many.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The gentlemen named were appointed deputy-governors of prisons by the Lord-Lieutenant under a former Government. I have no information as to who recommended these gentlemen, beyond the fact that their applications were supported by testimonials from military officers and Colonial governors, under whom they had served respectively. Prior to his appointment as deputy-governor, Major Owen Lewis had no experience of prison management, but Major Luscombe had such experience in the Colonies. No governors were passed over when these gentlemen were promoted to be second-class governors, because as deputy-governors they were of higher rank and pay than third-class governors. Mr. Boland was appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant to be deputy-governor on the recommendation of the General Prisons Board as being the best qualified for promotion. He had twenty-two years experience in the executive and the clerical ranks of the Irish prison service. The General Prisons Board considered that no local deputy-governor had prior claims or equal qualifications. Mr. Boland's salary as prison clerk was £120. His present salary is £180. A former sergeant of the Clare Militia is in prison service as clerk warder, but he has not been appointed storekeeper. I have no information as to the number of military applicants for the position of deputy-governor.

Irish Eviction Dates.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if in view of the importance to evicted tenants in Ireland of accurate information as to the dates on which they were evicted and other indispensable statistics, he will see that facilities are given under which some duly authorised person will be permitted o examine the books of the sheriff in each county, where necessary, as a Return of the particulars of evicted tenants whose applications were not yet lodged for reinstatement has been refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The hon. Member does not give any indication as to who he thinks should be authorised to examine the sheriff's books. If a necessity should be shown for taking any such step, I will ascertain whether I have power to give directions in the matter. I apprehend, however, that if a question should arise in any case as to the precise date of an eviction, or any other necessary detail, there would be no difficulty in ascertaining the facts.

Urlingford Drainage Charges.

MR. MEAGHER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the discontent which exists amongst the ratepapers of the Loughens, Urlingford, county Kilkenny, by reason of the assessment of certain drainage charges; whether he is aware that, in compliance with a petition of the ratepayers of Warrenstown, a neighbouring townland, certain other drainage works were carried on for their benefit, and that the whole of the charges of both places were levied off the lands of the Loughens; and whether he will send down an inspector to re-assess the charges in proportion to the benefit derived by both townlands.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I am informed that, as not uncommonly happens, it was necessary in this case, in order to carry out the works of maintenance in the district, to get rid of the dead water below the outfall. The work was not undertaken at the request of the ratepayers of Warrenstown, and, I understand, is of trivial advantage to that part of Warrenstown which is outside the drainage district. The cost of it is estimated at about £5, and would appear to be properly chargeable against the drainage district, which otherwise would not have derived the full benefit of the works.

Alleged Wrongful Detention in Monaghan Asylum.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a statement concerning Francis M'Donald, of county Cavan, who was, it is alleged, wrongfully detained in the district asylum at Monaghan from 5th June, 1900, until January, 1904; was an inquiry held into this alleged lunatic's case, and with what result; and whether, under all the circumstances, and having regard to the treatment of M'Donald, and to the sufferings which he endured, he will recommend the Local Government Board to remit the surcharge, and to consent to the Committee paying to M'Donald the sum of £74 15s. 2d. charged for his maintenance.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The hon. Member has forwarded to me the statement to which he refers. I am informed that on 5th September, 1905, the inspectors of lunatic asylums held an inquiry on oath, into the case, and found that M'Donald was legally committed to, and detained in, the asylum, but that more energy might have been displayed by the asylum officials in urging his relatives to enter into the necessary recognisances for his discharge after he had sufficiently recovered. M'Donald was charged by the Asylum Committee £74 15s. 2d. for maintenance during his detention. The Committee have expressed the intention of refunding this sum to M'Donald upon the ground that his property was squandered by his relatives during his detention. As the committee did not bring this sum into account the auditor considered it to be his duty to surcharge the members of the committee upon whose decision the sum was withheld from audit. The Local Government Board have received no appeal against this surcharge, but if such an appeal should be lodged they will duly inquire into and consider the matter.

Arklow Pier.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the engineer employed by the Arklow Harbour Board is unable to prepare plans for the extension of Arklow Pier without preliminary borings which cannot be made until the direction of the extension is decided upon; whether, with a view to preventing a useless expenditure of any part of the fund available, he will state if the Government agrees to the alignment of the pier, favoured by Mr. Wick, late chief engineer to the Board of Works, and adopted in April last by the Arklow Harbour Commissioners; and, if not, what alignment does it wish to have; whether, in view of the fact that the Arklow Harbour Commissioners have no funds available for the required borings, the Government will provide them out of the £7,000 already voted by Parliament; if he is aware that neither the question of alignment, nor of the funds for the borings, is dealt with in the letter from the Government to the Arklow Harbour Commissioners of May 28th last, to which the Commissioners are now referred, and that the engineer of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners declares his inability to proceed to the making of plans until these questions are settled by the Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I can best answer this Question by briefly stating the facts. The Government have promised a free grant of £14,000 towards works at Arklow Harbour, and £7,000 of this amount is provided in the Ireland Development Grant Estimate of the present year. The Arklow Harbour Board have long since been made aware of the conditions upon which the grant is to be made, namely, that the plans, specifications, and contract, which may be decided upon by the Harbour Board acting on the advice of their own engineer, are to be submitted to the Government, by whom they will be referred for examination and approval to the Government advising engineer. When the plans, etc., have been approved the Government will, from time to time, make payments to the Harbour Board up to the total of £14,000 upon the certificate of the Government engineer as to the satisfactory progress in the works. As to the preparation of the plans and specifications the Irish Government can give no advice. That is a question for the Harbour Board and their engineer, and the Government can take no further steps in the matter until the plans and specifications are submitted in adequate detail. Any expense incident to the supply of the plans and specifications will be dealt with as part of the expenses of the scheme, and will be payable out of the grant of £14,000.

Mr. Beresford's Stradbally Property.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet received a Report from their inspector, Mr. Guiry, who on the 2nd instant visited the estate of Mr. J. G. Beresford, who has lodged an application for the sale of his property near Stradbally, county Waterford, under the provisions of the Land Act, 1903; if a Report has been received from Mr. Guiry, what is the nature of that Report, and will he say whether Mr. Beresford's representative objected to the inspector inspecting portions of the estate consisting of evicted farms and untenanted lands; and, if so, what action the Commissioners purpose taking in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that their inspector's Report has not yet been received. The Commissioners will cause inquiries to be made into the allegation contained in the Question.

Caheroyan Property, Athenry.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners received a copy of a Resolution passed by the people of Athenry, wherein attention was drawn to the fact that an area of untenanted land, known as the Caheroyan property, adjoins the town and would be most beneficial if distributed amongst the town tenants on the Lambesh estate; whether these lands have been used from time immemorial by the residents of Athenry as accommodation lands; and will he advise the Estates Commissioners to acquire this property in the public interest.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received a copy of the resolution referred to, but are unable to identify the Caheroyan property from the information given. If further particulars, including the name and address of the landlord or his agent, should be furnished to the Commissioners they will have further inquiries made.

Catholics and the Donegal Grand Jury.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why a fair proportion of Catholics are not summoned to serve on the grand jury of the county Donegal: whether he will state the object of such exclusion; and whether he will try to have the grievance remedied.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am afraid that I cannot add anything to my reply to the hon. Member's similar Question of 26th March.[†] Grand juries are empanneled by high sheriffs in accordance with statute, and unless it should be shown that the provisions of the law have not been complied with, which I understand is not suggested, the Government have no power to interfere.

Lambert Minors' Estate, Athenry.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been directed to the uneconomic condition of a number of small holders of land on the Lambert Minors' estate, in the townlands of Caher Crin and Lacarn, near Athenry; whether the Estates Commissioners are presently engaged in trying to bring about an understanding between the tenants and the agent of the property with a view to purchase by the tenant; whether, having regard to the fact that there is no untenanted land on the Lambert property available for the enlargement of the tenants' holdings, and seeing that a grazing farm, known as the Monatigue Farm, runs alongside the tenants' holdings, he will instruct the Commissioners to open negotiations with the owner of this untenanted farm so as to have it purchased, if possible, in the interests of a general settlement of the estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that the receiver over the estate of Lambert Minors is in communication with the owner's solicitors with the object of instituting formal proceedings for the sale of the estate to the Estates Commissioners. The Commissioners understand that the estate contains a considerable area of untenanted land, which will be included in the sale. The Commissioners have no information as to the Monatigue farm, but will make inquiries with reference to it if the name of the owner or his agent should be furnished to them.

Todd-Thornton Estate, County Armagh.

MR. McKILLOP (Armagh, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether part of the lands comprising the Todd-Thornton estate, county Armagh, known as the Mullinune meadows, has recently been advertised for sale; and, if so, by whom; and whether, in view of the fact that the estate has been purchased by the tenants the Estates Commissioners will take the necessary steps to safeguard the interests of the tenants in connection with the proposed sale of the meadows.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have no knowledge as to whether the meadows referred to have been advertised for sale. Purchase agreements in respect of nine holdings, comprising 170 acres, in the townland of Mullynure have been lodged with the Commissioners, but they are unable to say whether the meadows referred to are included in the sale.

Mr. Robert Bailey of Fowney.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Mr. Robert Bailey, of Fowney, county Derry, who supported the Liberal candidate at the General Election, has been again visited by a gang of Orangemen, who mutilated a bullock belonging to him; whether other malicious damage had been previously done to his property;

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 829.

and whether the perpetrators of these outrages have been brought to justice.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that on the 11th instant Mr. Bailey reported to them that a considerable portion of the tail of a young bull, his property, had been maliciously cut off. The police found the fact to be as stated. Malicious injury to Mr. Bailey's property was also committed in January last, when a rick of hay was burnt and a heifer maliciously killed. The police have used every effort to discover the perpetrators of these outrages, but have not succeeded in bringing anyone to justice.

West Kent Regimental Tailor.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether in view of the fact that the quartermaster of the 1st Battalion Royal West Kent Regiment, testified to the work turned out under the supervision of Ex-Sergeant Master Tailor Pressley, as always well done and very satisfactory, he can say who informed him that Pressley was not fitted for the post; and whether the injury Pressley received in the Boer War prevented him joining as ordinary sergeant.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I have nothing to add to the full information which I have already given the hon. Member on this case.

Piershill Barracks, Edinburgh.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many cases of diphtheria have occurred at Piershill barracks during the last ten years, and how many of such cases are directly traceable to defective drainage at the barracks; and whether he is now in a position to state whether any steps have been taken to acquire a site for fresh barracks at Edinburgh in place of Piershill.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) There have been five cases of diphtheria during the last ten years, four of which were among children, and none of which were attributed by the medical officers in charge of barracks to any defects of the drainage system. There is no money at present available for the purpose suggested in the last part of the Question.

Gun Firing at Roker.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the annoyance of the inhabitants of Roker, Sunderland, caused by the periodical firing of guns at that place, the windows and doors of some of the houses being broken to an alarming extent; and, if so, whether it is his intention to take any action with a view to its discontinuance.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No complaints from this place have reached the War Office. The General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Northern Command, has been requested to report on the matter.

Duke of York's School Site

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state his proposals with regard to disposing of the site of the Duke York's School.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of the disposal of the site is being considered by an Interdepartmental Committee.

Piershill Barracks.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: To ask the Secretary of State for War if, now that his Army policy is settled, he will announce whether the insanitary barracks at Piershill can shortly be rebuilt.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*, These barracks are not, as suggested in the Question, absolutely insanitary, and they have not been condemned. But, in my opinion, they are not satisfactory as cavalry barracks. As, however, there are no funds at present available for the purpose of rebuilding I am not able to reply to the Question.

New Bayonet.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: To ask the Secretary of State for War if the pattern of the new bayonet to be issued to the troops has now been selected.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The pattern for the new bayonet has not yet been selected.

The Territorial Army.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he proposes to introduce legislation during the autumn dealing with the territorial army.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A Bill will be introduced, but I do not anticipate that the date chosen will be in the autumn session.

Messrs. Armstrong Whitworth and Company and the Volunteers.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the action of Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company, towards a number of their employees, who as Volunteers were called up to line the streets of Newcastle-on-Tyne on the occasion of their Majesties the King and Queen visiting the city on the 11th instant, and who, in consequence of the heavy rain, were drenched; whether he is aware that those men who were absent on the following day during the first quarter of the day were suspended for three days, and those who were absent the whole day were suspended for a week; and whether these Volunteers called on duty and sustaining loss are entitled to any compensation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No report to this effect has been received at the War Office. The circumstances as alleged in the Question would not warrant compensation from Army funds. The War Office neither did nor could compel Volunteers to line the streets.

Trade Mark Law in China.

MR. TILLETT (Norwich): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the new trade mark law in China has yet been brought into operation; if not, whether there is any likelihood of this taking place in the near future; whether the regulations proposed in 1904 have been amended; if so, in what manner; whether he has official reports showing that traders secure any real advantage from now depositing their trade marks at Shanghai; and whether registration of a trade make in China will prevail over a prior user of the same mark.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) 1. The Answer to the first Question is in the negative. 2. It is not possible to say when the regulations will come into force. 3. The regulations, as originally drafted, were not satisfactory. Amendments have been proposed by the representatives at Peking of the Foreign Powers, and the matter is still under discussion. 4. When His Majesty's Minister at Peking reported that the Chinese Government had agreed to suspend the operation of the regulations until an agreement had been come to with the Governments interested, he stated that the registration office at Shanghai would not be closed to applicants, but that as no marks could be registered this point was of no importance. 5. Pending the conclusion of the negotiations, I am unable to give the information asked for.

Natal Municipal Corporation Bill.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Municipal Corporations Bill now under consideration of the Natal Legislature contains a provision disfranchising all persons who are not in possession of the Parliamentary franchise; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government will decline to signify His Majesty's assent to this provision of the Bill which is calculated to operate hardly on British Indians in Natal who enjoy the privilege of a municipal franchise in their own country.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Bill referred to which was passed by the Natal Legislature a year ago contains such a provision, but saving existing rights. The Secretary of State received a telegram on the 17th instant purporting to be from British Indian Colonists in Natal, protesting against the Bill and especially this provision, and intimating that a memorial from the Natal Indian community is on its way. No representations had previously been addressed by the Indian community to him. The Secretary of State proposed to await the receipt of the memorial in question.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Municipal Corporations Bill, now under the consideration of the

Natal Legislature, contains a provision defining "uncivilised races" as all barbarous or semi-barbarous races, and all Indians introduced as identured labourers not actually under indenture and their descendants, unless their *status* is above that of labourers or domestic servants; and, if so, whether, having regard to the grievance which is very keenly felt in India arising from the classification of these British Indian subjects with barbarous or semi-barbarous races, His Majesty's Government will advise His Majesty to decline to signify His assent to this provision of the Bill until the words relating to His Majesty's Indian subjects are omitted.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Natal Municipal Corporations Bill contains the provision referred to. The Secretary of State has at the instance of the Government of india urged the Natal Government to procure the Amendment of the definition by the omission of the words relating to Indians, on the ground stated in the hon. Member's Question, and His Majesty's Government earnestly trust that a solution will be found which will meet the wishes of the Indian Government. Meanwhile, the Secretary of State has tendered no advice to His Majesty on the subject of the Bill.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether having regard to the fact that the word coolie is frequently used in South Africa as a general term, including all Asiatics of whatever standing, His Majesty's Government will take steps to ensure that in the Municipal Corporations Bill, now under the consideration of the Natal Legislature, the word coolie used therein shall be strictly defined so as to include only labourers actually serving under indenture, and labourers introduced under indenture, but whose indentures have expired and their descendants provided that they are not of a status above that of a labourer or domestic servant, and so protect respectable natives of India from the restrictions of the Bill which are imposed on coolies.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Government of India have raised the point, and the Secretary of State is in communication with the Government of Natal on the subject with a view to securing that the word "coolie" should be more clearly defined.

Valencia Shooting Case.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware of the arrest, on May 26th, and detention since, at Valencia, of a British engineer of the steamship "Gravina," on a charge of shooting on May 2nd, the fact being that the said engineer, David Taylor, fired a revolver in the air to attract the attention of the police after being stabbed in the street by a Spaniard, and from the effect of which he was in hospital for twenty-four days; and, if not aware of the circumstances, will he cause inquiry to be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George*): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The Board of Trade have received a report from the Consul General at Barcelona with regard to the matter referred to in the Question, and authority has been given to him to obtain legal assistance for Mr. Taylor, if necessary, and to provide him with adequate fare while he is in prison.

House of Commons Crockery.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether on account of the large wastage by breakage, the Office of Works has ceased to supply the House of Commons with plates, cups, and other articles of leadless glazed ware; whether the change of system was accompanied by any recommendation as to the use of leadless glaze or of ware coated with glaze which conforms to the standard adopted by the Office of Works in its own contracts; whether any similar change of system has taken place in case of other Departments formerly supplied by or advised by the Office of Works; and whether His Majesty's Government will consider the possibilty of again calling the attention of other Departments to the desirability of using ware coated with leadless glaze.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The change in the system whereby the Refreshment Committee of the House of Commons receives a subsidy in lieu of direct supplies of china and earthenware was not due to the large wastage by reason of leadless glaze being used, but to the fact that better control could be exercised over demands if the Committee had to pay directly for the supplies. The change affected supplies of all kitchen plant, linen, china, and glass. The change in the system took effect prior to the introduction of leadless glaze. The system of granting subsidies or allowances is general throughout the large public Departments. The attention of the various public Departments will be directed to the desirability of using ware coated with leadless glaze or with a glaze which conforms to the Office of Works standard, but the purchase of these articles is entirely in the discretion of the Refreshment Committees.

Agricultural Rating Grants.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Government will arrange that the payments made under the Agricultural Rates Act to spending shall be based not, as now, on the rates collected by spending authorities in one year but on the average of the rates collected by such spending authorities during the three preceding years to that in which payments are under the Act, for the reason that the rates collected by spending authorities have grown since 1895 by the enhanced cost of the Education Act, and also by the increased cost of the highways consequent on the Locomotive Acts, and Motor Car Acts and other causes, which together have increased the rates to such an extent that the sums now received by the spending authorities do not nearly amount to the half of the rates on agricultural land, which proportion is intended and professed to be paid to spending authorities under the Act

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Agricultural Rates Act requires that the annual payments under it shall be based on the amount of the rates raised during the year 1895–6. It does not admit of their being based on the rates collected during any later years, and, as I have stated in reply to previous Questions, I could not undertake to bring in a Bill to alter it in this respect.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.

MAJOR COATES (Lewisham): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will give a Return showing how many certificates of conscientious objections to vaccination were granted in the years 1904 and 1905, respectively, and how many were refused.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The number of certificates received by the vaccination officers in 1904 and 1905 respectively, was 39,512 and 41,687. I am not able to say how many applications for certificates were refused, and the information could not be obtained without considerable difficulty.

Metropolitan Borough Councils and Parliamentary Costs.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will grant a Return of the expenses incurred by the Metropolitan borough councils in Parliamentary proceedings since their creation; and what proportion of such expenses has been incurred in opposing Bills promoted by the central authority.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) If my hon. friend will move for a Return to the effect suggested I shall be happy to assent to it. Perhaps he will send me a draft of his Motion before he puts it down.

Stansted Tuberculosis Experimental Farm.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the amount of the grant originally made for the tuberculosis experimental farm at Stansted, Essex; what public moneys have since been expended thereon; and whether he will assent to a Return showing how the money is expended; the number of milk-cows and young heifers which have been purchased from the Channel Islands, and other places, and how they have been disposed of; the number of animals killed; and the number which have died under treatment; and whether he proposes to allow the continuance of this institution, having regard to the fact that it is locally considered a public nuisance.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the amounts voted for and expended by the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis include the following sums in respect of the work at the farms and laboratory at Stansted.

Year.	Amount included in Vote.	Amount Expended.
	£	£
1901–2	—	1,368
1902–3	10,750	9,799
1903–4	7,853	7,296
1904–5	7,969	8,064
1905–6	7,635	7,473
1906–7	7,765	About £2,000, to date

I am informed that the other details asked for in the Question will appear in the Report and Appendix which the Commission now have in preparation. I am not aware of any sufficient reason for suggesting that the work should be discontinued.

Education Committees and Travelling Expenses.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will advise the Government to take steps to have inserted in the Education Bill, before it passes into law, a provision empowering local education authorities to pay the reasonable travelling expenses of its members when attending any of its meetings or the meetings of its education committee or any sub-committee of the same.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The matter referred to, involving, as it does, questions of rates, cannot be dealt with.

Access to Education Authorities' Documents.

DR. MACNAMARA: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will advise the Government to take steps to have inserted in the Education Bill before it passes into Law a clause re-enacting Section 87 of the Education Act of 1870, which gave ratepayers the right of access, under reasonable conditions, to the documents of the local education authority for the area.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is too late now to consider the introduction of a new clause of this Bill. It is a matter which is best left to the discretion of local authorities.

New End, Hampstead, and Eltham Schools.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the proposal of the London County Council to place under one male head teacher the combined departments (viz., for boys and girls respectively) of the school at New End, Hampstead, and also to a similar proposal in respect of the Deansfield Road, Eltham school; and whether, having regard to the efficient education of the girls and in justice to the women teachers, he will withhold his assent from these proposals.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Board of Education have received no proposals as yet from the London County Council in regard to the matters named in the Question. I will see that they are carefully considered if and when they are submitted for the sanction of the Board.

Orange Postal Officials at Lisnalong.

MR. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the conduct of the postman and postmaster of Lisnalong, county Monaghan, who is a member of the Orange Society, and who attended a recent meeting under the auspices of such society in Clones in full regalia; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not aware of the circumstances referred to, but I am making inquiry and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Telegraphing Figures.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General whether there is a rule throughout the telegraph service, that in order to prevent error, all figures in public telegrams are repeated by the signalling clerk at the time of transmission, and in the event of mistakes being made, the receiving telegraphist is liable to fine and the error recorded against him; whether by order of the Deputy Controller of the Central Telegraph Office, a regulation has been issued, forbidding the repetition of figures on the circuits between Grimsby and London; and, if so, will the Postmaster-General state why this safeguard has been removed between these offices, and whether the staff will be fined for the errors which may arise.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is a rule that figures in public telegrams are to be repeated by the signalling clerk at the time of transmission, but it has not been applied to certain of the most important circuits, and the necessity for it at the present day is doubtful. Instructions were given, not by the Deputy Controller of the Central Telegraph Office, but from head quarters, for its waiver experimentally between Grimsby and London. The result of the experiment will be carefully watched. A fine is not imposed or a record made against a telegraphist automatically either in the event of an error or in any other circumstances. Careful inquiry is always made into the merits of the case and the change of rule on the Grimsby circuits would of course be a factor for consideration.

Belfast Postal Staff Grievances.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Postmaster-General, if, in course of the last two years, several deputations were received by the postmaster of Belfast, protesting, in the name of the staff, against the character of, at least, two promotions; and will he say if Reports as to the result of these interviews were made to headquarters.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No such Reports can be traced; and I have no information regarding the deputations to which the hon. Member refers.

Belfast Mail Van Drivers.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Postmaster-General if he will cause inquiry to be made into the conditions under which mail-van drivers are employed in Belfast, ascertaining their rate of wages and their weekly average attendances.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will make inquiry on the subject.

Belfast Letter Deliveries.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Postmaster-General under what circumstances and on whose recommendation the arrangement to restrict the deliveries of letters in Belfast on the 12th instant was cancelled; was he consulted before the cancellation took place; and had he been previously advised that this public holiday was the most widely and the most generally observed in the city.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The matter came before me for decision. Having regard to the nature of the celebration I did not think it advisable to grant a special holiday.

Magherafelt Rural Postman.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Postmaster-General, whether he is aware that Thomas Stewart, rural postman, Magherafelt, county Derry, swore last week during a civil trial that he is in the habit of wearing Orange regalia and marching in Orange processions on 12th July; whether he is aware that this man has also been convicted for using party expressions calculated to lead to a breach of the peace; and what steps he proposes to take to put a stop to such proceedings by a public servant.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will make inquiry on the subject and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the contention that established clerks to the surveyors of taxes were formerly employed in large numbers and found to be unsatisfactory, he will furnish particulars showing the precise number of such clerks that were employed; whether he is aware that such clerks occupied the positions usually held by assistant surveyors, and ultimately became surveyors of taxes; and, seeing that their employment was an experiment, with a view to ultimately recruiting the assistant surveyorships from the ranks of the second division clerks, whether he will state what steps he now proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I am informed that the employment of a certain number of established clerks in surveyors' offices was in operation from 1877 to 1894, and during that period the total number so employed was 111. The greatest number employed at any one time was fifty-four. The second division clerks did not occupy the positions usually held by assistant surveyors. In 1886 it was decided to abandon the system, and, as a means of providing for the clerks employed at the time, the position of assistant surveyor was thrown open to those of ten years full service. As a consequence fifty clerks became in the course of the next few years assistant surveyors. The recruitment of the assistant surveyor class from the clerk class was no part of the original scheme, but was adopted merely as a means of facilitating the abolition of the employment of established clerks in surveyors' offices.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the number of clerkships (1) in Section C and (2) in Section D in offices of surveyors of taxes in England and in Ireland, respectively; the number of clerks promoted to Section C clerkships in England during the five years ended 31st March, 1906, and who were employed in English offices previous to their promotion; the number of clerks who have been promoted to Section C clerkships in England and Ireland, respectively, during the same time, and who held Irish Section D clerkships previous to promotion; and whether, seeing that when vacancies occur in English offices, surveyors object to selecting Irish clerks who have had no experience of English work, and that the Board of Inland Revenue have drawn up regulations as to promotion which would appear to apply to the whole body of tax clerks and not to any particular section of them, he will inquire into the position of Section D clerks in Irish offices with a view to affording them the same opportunities of promotion as English clerks enjoy.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) (1) The number of clerkships (Sections B, C, and D) in England and Ireland respectively, is as follows:—

	England.	Ireland.
Section B - -	23	3
Section C - -	52	2
Section D - -	139	14

(2) The number of English clerks promoted to Section C during the five years ended 31st March, 1903, was twenty-four; (3) The number of Irish clerks promoted to Section C during the same period was two, one of whom was promoted by an English district; (4) In selecting clerks for the higher and more important districts, men with experience qualifying them for the work of such districts are naturally chosen. I can only express my regret if, as the hon. Member suggests, this practice operates to the disadvantage of the Irish clerks.

Custom House Watchers' Wages.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the wages of Custom House watchers at Tilbury, Gravesend, and Queenborough, are on a lower scale than those of watchers at other places in the port of London; and, if so, whether the watchers at these three places can now be put on the same footing as the other watchers in the port.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) One fourth of the Customs watchers at the places referred to rise to the same maximum pay as the watchers in London; witht his qualification the Answer to the first of the Question is in the affirmative. The higher pay for London watchers was granted in respect of the higher cost of living in London, and after careful consideration I am of opinion that this distinction should be maintained.

Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain upon what grounds an inquiry into the *status* and treatment of the clerks to surveyors of taxes is refused; whether he is aware these grievances are not confined to the clerks themselves, but include the surveyors also; and whether, in view of this fact, he will direct an inquiry, with a view to eliciting the exact conditions under which these clerks work.

(*Answered by Mr McKenna.*) The grounds of refusal are that all the facts are fully known, that they have been carefully examined and considered both by the Treasury and by the Board on more than one occasion in recent years, and that there is no reason to suppose that further inquiry would affect the judgment of the Treasury or of the Board of Inland Revenue.

Bengal Newspaper Subscribers.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will inquire into the measures which it is alleged are being taken in Eastern Bengal and Assam to ascertain and record the names of subscribers to Bengal newspapers, and will consider whether it is not desirable to put a stop to official espionage of this nature?

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I will inquire whether the allegations referred to have any foundation in fact.

Indian Gold Standard Reserve.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India if the Government of India has decided to hold in silver a portion of the gold reserve fund created to maintain the the exchange value of the rupee silver currency; and, in such case, can he state the present total amount of the fund and the amounts now held in gold, securities, and silver, respectively?

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have approved a proposal made by the Government of India that a portion of the gold standard reserve shall be held in silver. The nominal value of the British Government securities held on behalf of the reserve is £13,103,000. No gold is at present held in the reserve. Silver to the value of about £2,500,000 will in due course be transferred to the reserve; so far, £1,056,000 has been transferred.

July Celebrations at North Fermanagh.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there was any breach of the peace caused by the 12th of July celebrations in North Fermanagh; was there any suspension of the ordinary courtesies between Protestants and Roman Catholics reported to him from that district in connection with the celebrations; have any speeches made at the celebrations been reported by the police as tending to a breach of the peace; how many extra police were drafted into the the district; and had such extra police anything to do?

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that the Answer to the first inquiry is in the negative. The Answers to the second and third inquiries are also in the negative. No extra police were drafted into county Fermanagh on July 12th.

Dromore Drainage.

MR. MCKEAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what has been the decision of the Board of Works in reference to the Report of Mr. Ryan on the inquiry held two years ago at Cootehill as to the drainage scheme of the Dromore river between Ballybay and Cootehill; why the Board of Works have taken no action in the matter; and whether the said Board purposes adopting the scheme recommended by Mr. W. F. Barry, the engineer to the local committee who sanctioned his scheme?

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I am informed that Mr. Ryan reported on this scheme on the 24th June, 1904. The report was adverse to the scheme, which

Mr. Ryan found to be inadequate and too expensive for the benefit to be expected of it. After considering this Report the Board of Works decided not to sanction the scheme. An intimation of this decision was conveyed to the secretary of the local committee on the 27th September, 1904, together with a copy of Mr. Ryan's Report.

Police Visitation.

Mr. McKEAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland for what reason and upon whose authority the police from Rockcorry station make domiciliary visits to the houses of the inhabitants of Anney, near Rockcorry; whether such a visit has been paid to the house of a man named Fitzpatrick by police from the aforesaid station; and whether he will explain under what authority such visits are made.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that the only visits paid this year by the police of Rockcorry station to the inhabitants of Anney were for the purpose of collecting agricultural statistics. Fitzpatrick's house was visited for that purpose only. The police have not been instructed to pay visits for any other purpose.

Appointments of Toomebridge Petty Sessions Clerk.

Mr. McKEAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the petty sessions clerk at Toomebridge also holds the following positions: postmaster of Toomebridge, lessee of Toome and Kilrea eel fishery, manager of the Killsegour mines, Toome, land agent for Mrs. Jones, Moneyglass, estate and land agent for Lady Spencer, Castledawson estate; whether he is aware that this official is likewise a sand contractor; that he is absent from Toome on Wednesday in connection with the Kilrea fishery, and on Saturday in connection with other of his offices, and discharges some duties of his position as petty sessions clerk by deputy; and; in in the interests of the public service, and seeing that so recently as twelve months ago the then Chief Secretary insisted on another petty sessions clerk who held only one other position in addition to his official one relinquishing that one, whether he purposes taking any action in the matter?

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to my Answer to his Question on this subject on March 23rd.† The clerk of petty sessions is not precluded, either by statute or by order of the Lord-Lieutenant, from holding all or any of the positions mentioned. As the petty sessions are held but once a month, the duties of the clerk are light, and the salary proportionately small. The clerk attends for three hours on three days a week, which is considered a sufficient attendance. He performs his duty to the satisfaction of the registrar of petty sessions clerks, and without complaint by the public. In these circumstances no action appears to be called for. I am not aware of the case to which reference is made in the concluding part of the Question.

Earl of Lucan's Pontoon Property.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what price was paid by the Congested Districts Board to the Earl of Lucan for the portion of his estate in the Pontoon electoral division of the Castlebar Union, county Mayo, and what rights, if any, have been reserved by the Earl of Lucan; have the townlands of Knockalanagh, Garrihill, and Pontoon, or any portions of them, been included in the sale; and, if so, have any portions of them been resold by the Congested Districts Board to the Earl of Lucan, and, if so, for what reason and for what price; how many holdings in Pontoon electoral division have been striped by the Congested Districts Board; how many so striped are under a £3 valuation and how many under £10.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Pontoon portion of the Earl of Lucan's estate was not separately valued when purchased by the Congested Districts Board, but, on the basis of the rental, the estimated price would be £18,162. The only rights reserved by Lord Lucan are the sporting rights on the lands of Knockaglana. The Board have purchased the townlands of Knockaglana and Garrihill, excepting about 47 acres out of a total of 1,036 in Knockaglana. The portion not purchased by the Board contains a hotel, constabulary barrack, and other buildings. There is no townland named Pontoon.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 740.

No portion of the lands bought has been resold to the vendor. Forty-five holdings in Pontoon division have been striped by the Board. Of these fourteen are under £3 valuation, twenty-nine are under £10, and two are over £10.

Army Sergeants and Plain Clothes.

Dr. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will now state the date when permission was granted to sergeants to keep plain clothes in barracks; whether permissson was by Army order or letter; and to whom was it communicated.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The amended edition of the King's Regulations, containing amendments to this effect, has been delayed, and it is not possible to publish it as early as was anticipated. The Army Council propose accordingly to issue a circular on the subject.

Military Guard of Honour at Irish Assizes.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War by whose order a guard of honour of the 4th Battalion Northumberland Fusiliers, with band and colours, was mounted at the courthouse, Limerick, on the opening of the County Limerick Summer Assizes on the 6th July last, and under what King's Regulation was it furnished.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is not known at the War Office by whose order the guard of honour was mounted, but the regulation granting such a guard will be found in paragraph 65 (v.) of the King's Regulations.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Indian Legislative Councils.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Committee appointed in India to consider the question of reforming the constitution of the legislative councils in that country consists of officials only; and, if so, whether he will suggest to the Government of India the desirability of adding an unofficial member, and preferentially a native of India, to that Committee.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs): I have stated that this Committee will be chosen from the Executive Council, and I see no more reason for the hon. Member's suggestion than I should for the addition of an unofficial member to a Committee of the Cabinet in this country.

Thibet.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India when he proposes to lay further Papers on Thibet.

Mr. MORLEY: The only Papers which it is proposed at present to lay on the Table are connected with the Convention with China of the 27th of April last as to the Lhasa Convention of 1904. This Convention will be published shortly as soon as ratifications have been exchanged with the Chinese Government.

Indian Cotton Industries.

Mr. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to a report by Mr. W. T. Fee, United States Consul at Bombay, on the cotton industries of India, in which he states that the conditions and standard of labour in the Bombay cotton mills are the lowest in any Asiatic country; whether he is aware that the operatives (many of whom are women and young people) have to work continuously from five a.m. till eight p.m. with only half-an-hour's break; and whether he will take steps to induce the Indian Government to legislate on lines that will put an end to such conditions.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the Report of the United States Consul at Bombay, in which he states that the hours of cotton operatives in India have been lengthened since the introduction of electric light, so that they are now from five in the morning until eight in the evening, with only half-an-hour's stoppage for meals; whether he is aware that there are no restrictions on the hours of male operatives over fourteen years of age; and whether he will take any steps in the matter.

MR. MORLEY: I have read the Report referred to. The whole question is engaging my close attention, and I am expecting to receive shortly the reports on the hours and conditions of labour in Indian factories, and the recommendations of the Local Governments and of the Government of India, as to the defects of the existing law and the measures necessary to effect the desired improvements. I intend to lose no time in dealing with this important question

A Question by Mr. Shackleton as to a report by an English inspector and the reply of Mr. Morley thereto were both inaudible in the Press gallery.]

Superintendent of Foreign Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what are the specific duties of the Superintendent of Foreign Labour with regard to applications by Chinese coolies in the Transvaal for repatriation; what is the nature of the information he is required to obtain from each applicant, and if any inquiry is made to test its accuracy; and whether the character and good conduct of each applicant, while in the Colony, is investigated, and by whom.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The hon. Member will see from the terms of the notification printed at page 190 of Cd. 3025 the nature of the duties of the Superintendent of Foreign Labour, by whom the notification is signed, and also the nature of the information he is required to obtain. He undertakes to review the circumstances of each case, and for that purpose is expected to make any necessary inquiry into the accuracy of the information and the character and conduct of the applicant. I may add, however, that no obstacle has prevented any of the coolies who have hitherto applied from returning to China.

Religious Processions in Malta.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a few months ago a seaman, serving in a ship on the Mediterranean station, died, and was buried in Malta; that the chaplain of the ship walked to the cemetery in his surplice with the funeral procession; that the Roman Catholic Archbishop protested against this proceeding; and that, in view of this protest, an order was issued by the Government to the effect that in future only Roman Catholic chaplains would be allowed to accompany funeral processions wearing their vestments; will he say if this order is still in force; and, if so, why it is retained.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have not heard of the particular incident referred to by the hon. Member; but processions of non-Catholics in Malta have hitherto not been allowed because of the apprehension that breaches of the peace would arise from such processions. The Secretary of State has the whole Question under consideration, but, pending his decision, it should certainly not be assumed that Lord Elgin is indifferent to the just claims of the other religious bodies.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) asked whether in all ecclesiastical matters the Government allowed the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Malta to be practically a dictator.

MR. CHURCHILL: I should have notice of a Question like that.

MR. SLOAN: Is there a by-law prohibiting processions other than Roman Catholic?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have fully answered the Question. I have stated that processions of non-Catholics have not hitherto been allowed, and I presume that an order to that effect has been in existence for some years—long before we were responsible for the conduct of affairs. I also said that the Secretary of State had the whole matter under his consideration. The hon. Gentleman need not be under any apprehension that the claims of the religious denomination with which he is concerned will not be fairly considered.

MR. T. L. CORBETT asked whether the chaplain of a ship would be allowed to attend the funeral of a seaman.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is very unusual, I believe, for a chaplain of the Church of England to move in procession with the funeral *cortége* through the streets; it is customary to await the corpse at the cemetery. I have said I have no knowledge of the particular incident referred to.

MR. SLOAN: When will the House be placed in possession of the decision of the Government on the matter?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member had better give notice of that.

Federated Malay States—Gambling Houses.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to a petition against licensed gambling houses in the Federated Malay States, signed by the leading Chinese gentlemen, merchants, tin-miners, shopkeepers, and leading European residents, and which was sent to His Excellency Sir John Anderson, K.C.M.G., His Majesty's High Commissioner of the Federated Malay States; if he will state what is the annual income derived from such gaming licences; and if he will take steps to abolish them.

MR. CHURCHILL: A copy of the petition referred to has just been received by the Secretary of State from the Methodist Episcopal Mission in the Straits Settlements. The High Commissioner will be asked for a report upon the subject, and his report must be awaited before any decision can be taken. I am not at present able to state what annual income is derived from the gaming licences.

Looting Loyal Natives' Kraals in Natal.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he now has any official information with reference to the robbing of natives not known to be disloyal and the burning of their kraals, as admitted by the military court of inquiry; and whether he will request the Government of Natal to appoint a Colonial Commission of Inquiry to investigate into the conduct of these soldiers.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have not yet received official information on the subject. The Secretary of State is not in a position to make such a request. The matter is one to be dealt with by the local government on its own responsibility with due regard to the opinion of the Colonial Parliament. The Governor of Natal has informed the Secretary of State that his Government have already arranged for Justice Beaumont to make independent inquiry in regard to certain charges made by the Bishop of Zululand apparently on wrong information which he still repeats though now in a modified form.

Slavery in Zanzibar.

* SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will be in a position to announce any decision as to the abolition of the legal *status* of slavery in the Zanzibar coast strip before the debate on the Colonial Office Vote.

MR. CHURCHILL: This matter is receiving the attention of the Secretary of State, who is most anxious to secure the abolition of the legal *status* of slavery at the earliest possible moment, but I am afraid that it will not be practicable to announce any decision before the debate on Tuesday next.

The Return of the Chief Nana to Southern Nigeria.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the decision to return the chief Nana to his own people has been telegraphed out to the authorities.

MR. CHURCHILL: The decision to allow Nana to return to Southern Nigeria has been communicated to the authorities by telegraph.

The Decapitation of Bambaata.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state, and, if not, whether he will ascertain, under whose orders Major Platt the officer charged with the duty of identifying the body of Bambaata was serving; whether any Report adverse to Major Platt has been made by his commanding officer; and, if so, whether he will request the authorities concerned to order an inquiry to be made so that Major Platt may have an opportunity of meeting the charges which have been brought against him.

MR. CHURCHILL: In reply to this, as well as to the other Question, No. 100,† addressed to the Secretary of State for War on this subject, I desire to point out that Major Platt is not an officer of the Royal Army Medical Corps, and is serving as a member of the Natal Field Force. I am not aware that any charges have been made against Major Platt, but were any so preferred, the question of the holding of an inquiry would be a matter for the consideration of the local authorities.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON desired to remind the hon. Gentleman that certain charges had been made in this House against Major Platt's action in regard to the decapitation of Bambaata.

MR. ARNOLD FORSTER (Croydon): Does the hon. Gentleman's Answer mean that no charges are made against Major Platt?

MR. CHURCHILL: It means precisely what I said in the Answer—I am not aware that any charges have been made.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Then I understand that no charges have been made except in this House.

Native Losses in Natal.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of native prisoners who have surrendered to the Natal troops on May 10th, June 10th, and July 20th, respectively, and the casualties on the respective days named.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is informed that up to and including June 10th, the number of prisoners taken and surrendered was 690, and that the number recorded since that date makes up to 2,750 in all. He was not yet in possession of detailed information for the respective days.

New Constitution for the Transvaal.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in arranging a new Constitution for the Transvaal Colony, and in view of the representations of the Progressive Party of the Colony, the Government will give careful consideration to the fact that the gold mines of the Rand will probably be largely exhausted within thirty years, and that the present mining population must therefore be regarded as an unstable and transient factor in the Colony's development.

MR. CHURCHILL: No statement can with advantage be made upon this subject until the decisions of His Majesty's Government can be presented to Parliament as a whole.

South African War Claims.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in view of the number of unpaid claims arising out of the South African war, and the dissatisfaction existing among claimants, His Majesty's Government will take into consideration the desirability of re-opening the whole question and providing for a fresh assessment.

MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Member will recognise, when he has perused the Report of the Central Judicial Commission which will appear in the Parliamentary Paper to be issued to-day, how extremely difficult it would be to re-open the whole question. The labours of the Commission extended over a period of three and a half years from October 30th, 1902 to February 28th, 1906, the date of their report, and covered thousands upon thousands of claims. The work was therefore practically completed before His Majesty's present Government came into office. The funds for distribution among the various heads of cases amounted to £9,500,000 and have been expended. In connection with two of the funds the ex-burgher Free Grant of £3,000,000 and the fund for British subjects and neutral foreigners, of

---

† MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether Major Platt, the officer who was charged with the duty of identifying the body of Bambaata, was serving under the orders of the General Officer Commanding, Natal; if not, under whose orders he was serving; whether any Report adverse to Major Platt has been made by his commanding officer; and, if so, will an inquiry be held so that Major Platt may have an opportunity of meeting the charges which have brought against him.

£2,000,000, the number of claims considered in both Colonies were in the case of the first fund 42,319, and in the case of the second 11,549 (exclusive of native cases). In a series of transactions on so gigantic a scale, the observance of the rules laid down is bound to produce many hard cases, and some dissatisfaction is absolutely unavoidable. The local administrations, it is understood, strongly deprecate any re-opening of the whole question on the ground that the present situation is generally accepted and that such re-opening would give rise to inordinate expectations, which would inevitably be doomed to disappointment. As I informed the hon. Member on June 25th,† His Majesty's Government do not contemplate recommending to the House of Commons the provision of further funds by Parliament, and that being the case any action involving further expenditure to be provided from Colonial funds will have to rest with the Legislatures of the two Colonies under responsible government.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: May I ask whether in fact in one case at least the matter has been re-opened, and a grant made?

MR. CHURCHILL: I am not aware of such a case.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Does this answer apply definitely to every specific case? Will not individual cases be considered?

MR. CHURCHILL: It may be that there are cases which are still being discussed, but my Answer applies to any general re-opening of the claims for compensation.

Railways, Freight to West Africa.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if, in view of the calculated further railway extension in West Africa for the development of the country, he will state what rates of freight do the Government pay to the liners for carriage of the different kinds of goods shipped to each separate Colony of West Africa; what tonnage per annum during the last five years have been shipped to each Colony; what has been the total freight paid by each Colony during the past five years; and what saving in freight might be anticipated if the Government freights were open to public competition.

MR. CHURCHILL: I shall be happy to give the hon. Member a list of the rates paid by the Governments of the West African Colonies on the various classes of goods shipped for them to West Africa. But it would take some weeks to compile the figures asked for as to tonnage and freight during the last five years, and I hope that the hon. Member will not press for them. I can assure him that the Government will not neglect any opportunity which they may have of promoting competition, and so securing a reduction in the rates of freight to West Africa.

Uganda—Sleeping Sickness.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if, in view of the nature of the sleeping sickness in Uganda, and that Entebbe, the capital, is about the worst spot on the lake, he will take the opportunity of conferring with two gentleman from Uganda of the highest position, and who have more knowledge and experience of the country than any other persons can have, namely, the Bishop of Uganda, and Dr. Moffat, the senior medical officer of Uganda, with the object of removing the seat of government at any rate temporarily to Kampala.

MR. CHURCHILL: As I informed the hon. Member in my reply to his Question of June 28th,† we have not been led to form the opinion that Kampala would be a more convenient capital or less exposed to the disease of sleeping sickness. The Secretary of State has had the advantage of an interview with the Bishop, and will, however, also ascertain the views of Dr. Moffat and of Mr. George Wilson, the Deputy Commissioner who is on leave in this country.

Responsibility for Military Operations in Natal.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reference to the allegations made by the Bishop of Zululand in respect of the alleged looting of the stock, clothes, and other property of non-combatant natives by Colonel Royston's column, and the further allegations concerning the shooting of non-combatant natives by that column, and in view of the reluctance of the Colonial Secretary to address representations to the Government of Natal concerning the conduct of military operations, whether he can say under what flag these operations are now being conducted, and from whom do the military officers commanding the native and Colonial levies hold their present commissions.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 641.

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1123.

MR. CHURCHILL: The operations in Natal, being part of the Empire, are conducted under the British flag. Officers of the Natal forces receive their commissions from the Governor of the Colony and take the oath of allegiance to His Majesty.

MR. FLYNN asked whether the Imperial Government declined all responsibility in connection with the proper conduct of the campaign in this country.

MR. CHURCHILL: No; we do not decline all responsibility, but, as I have said, our responsibility is indirect.

MR. FLYNN asked whether constant inquiry would be made as to the proper conduct of the campaign.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes; we have asked to be supplied with the fullest information at all times with regard to the conduct of affairs in Natal, and the Natal Government so far has evinced every disposition to meet our wishes.

Morocco.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool); I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any official information as to the refusal of the Moorish Government to recognise as valid titles to land obtained by Europeans in the Tangier district, such titles having been granted by Raisuli, the duly appointed Governor of that district; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): It is a fact that the Moorish Government refuse to recognise the validity of certain sales of Government property authorised by Raisuli. Under Article 11 of the Madrid Convention of 1880 no sales of real property to foreigners in Morocco can be effected without the previous consent in each case of the Moorish Government, and there is no reason to believe that the power to give such consent has been delegated to Raisuli or any other provincial Governor.

MR. ASHLEY: Then do I understand that Europeans have power to own land in Morocco subject to the consent of the Central Government?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No sales can be effected to Europeans without the previous consent of the Moorish Government.

Bahr-el-Gazal.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can now make a statement as to the evacuation of the Soudanese Bahr-el-Gazal by Congolese troops.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am unable to make any statement on the subject at present.

Brunei and the Anhui Mining Contract.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is now in a position to make any statement relating to affairs at Brunei, and to the present position in regard to the Anhui mining contract.

SIR EDWARD GREY: My hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies will answer the first portion of this Question; as to the latter part I have to say that I am not yet in a position to add anything to the Answer given to the hon. Member on June 14th.†

MR. CHURCHILL: I have been asked to answer the first part of this Question, which I presume refers to the Question asked by the hon. Member on May 3rd.† As promised in the Answer to that Question, the Resident at Brunei was asked for a report, the Secretary of State's despatch being dated May 5th. There has as yet hardly been time for a reply, which would be sent through the High Commissioner at Singapore, and probably some delay will have been caused by the illness of the Resident. The matter will not be overlooked.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 1136.

† See (4) *Debates*, clvi., 710.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Has there been any new departure of policy?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to reply in the negative, but the remainder of his Answer, and a further supplementary Question and Answer were quite inaudible in the Press Gallery.

Macedonian Budget.

MR. BOWLES (Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the military expenditure of the Macedonian Budget is nearly double the civil expenditure; that the military expenditure has hitherto been defrayed out of the Turkish Imperial funds; that any increase of Turkish Customs duties earmarked for Macedonia would set free an equal amount of Turkish Imperial funds; and whether, in view of the importance of this matter to British interests, he can state the grounds upon which he bases his opinion that such funds, so set free, could not be used towards finding the guarantee required for the Baghdad railway.

SIR EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Government are aware of the proportion of expenditure under military and civil heads respectively. The military expenditure has not hitherto been defrayed out of Imperial funds, as in the Ottoman Empire each vilayat has to bear the charge of its own garrison. Any increase in the Customs would set free a certain, though not necessarily an equal, amount of Imperial funds. His Majesty's Governmant are unable, in view of the various financial necessities of the Ottoman Empire, to determine how such funds would be applied.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would stipulate for the regulation of the Turkish military expenditure now charged to the Macedonian Budget before giving the consent of this country to the proposed increase in the Customs duties.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The question of what conditions should be made is still under consideration, and I can make no further statement on the subject.

Russian Tariffs

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will detail the steps taken by His Majesty's Government to persuade the Russian Government to reduce its proposed augmented tariff on British goods, and if the refusal is due to the absence of any inducement or bargain as regards Russian goods in British markets; and, if not, to what cause.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As the hon. and gallant Member was informed on on February 26th,† representations with respect to the rates of the new Russian tariff were addressed by His Majesty's Government to the Russian Government. In reply, the Russian Government intimated that the rates originally established by their new tariff have been considerably modified in numerous directions by the recent Russo-German treaty, and that of these reductions the United Kingdom receives the benefit by the operation of the most-favoured-nation clause in the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1858–59. I may add for the information of the hon. and gallant Member that the increases in the Russian tariff, though doubtless restrictive of trade, affect British trade to a smaller extent than that of the countries with which Russia has carried on tariff negotiations.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay Papers on the subject?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will consider that.

House of Commons Police.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether policemen receive any extra pay for extra duty in consequence of the House of Commons sitting until the early hours of the morning.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii, 781.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): In addition to the ordinary pay of their rank the police employed at the Houses of Parliament receive an allowance of one shilling a day. No additional money allowance is made to them on the occasion of late sittings, but the men are relieved for refreshments from time to time, and compensation in the shape of "time off" and also in extra leave is allowed when the House is not sitting.

Vaccination Fines at Chester-le-Street.

MR. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of prosecutions under the Vaccination Acts and orders, the number of fines inflicted, and the number of certificates of exemption granted in the petty sessional division of Chester-le-Street for the three years ending December 31st, 1905.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I could no doubt obtain the information desired by asking the Clerk to the Justices to have a search made in the records of the petty sessional court, and I shall be willing to do so if the hon. Member will be so good as to furnish me with sufficient grounds for making the enquiry.

Prison Officers Grievances.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what reply he has given to the petition from the prison officers in His Majesty's local prisons asking that they may be placed upon the same scale of pay as the officers of His Majesty's convict prisons.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The matter is still under consideration and no reply has yet been given to the petition.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: When may I expect a reply?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I cannot give a definite answer.

Leckhampton Hill Riot.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that the prisoner Barrett, who was sentenced to four months hard labour in connection with the Leckhampton Hill riot, and who, on the evidence of the police witnesses, was not present at the riot, and endeavoured to dissuade the people from doing any illegal act, has already been in prison three weeks; that Barrett is a man of delicate health; and will he advise the Crown to exercise its prerogative and grant the immediate release of this man and not delay his decision in regard to Barrett until he has decided the question of a reduction of the sentences passed on the other prisoners.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: As I have said before, the Secretary of State is inquiring carefully into the case, but I am afraid I cannot make any statement respecting any recommendations which he may ultimately make with regard to it. I can only say that in dealing with it there shall be no avoidable delay.

Motor Accidents in London.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department having regard to the fact that although motor-cars, motor cycles, and motor omnibuses were responsible for 1,905 accidents in the Metropolitan police area, 489 resulting in cases of personal injury and thirteen deaths, no licences have been either suspended or cancelled, so that motorists who during these two months or on previous occasions have been found guilty in courts of law of reckless driving, causing personal injury and sometimes death, continue to drive unchecked; will he consider the expediency of taking such steps as may be necessary to have the licences of such motorists suspended, with a view to the licences being finally cancelled after repeated offences.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The suspending of a licence is, by Section 4 of the Motor-Car Act, 1903, a matter for the court, which may also declare a person convicted to be disqualified for obtaining a licence for such further time after the expiration of the licence as the court thinks fit. The Secretary of State has no authority to interfere with the courts in the exercise of their judicial powers. The Commissioners of Police have power to refuse the renewal of licences to motor omnibus drivers under the Hackney

Carriage Acts. Convictions for wantonly driving a motor omnibus are considered to disqualify a man from driving such a vehicle, and since the 1st July, 1906, the renewal of seven licences has been refused on this account, while the case of other drivers has been noted for consideration at the proper time.

MR. WEIR pressed for an Answer to the last part of his Question.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL pointed out that the whole matter was under the consideration of the Government in connection with the Report of the Motor Traffic Commission.

Lunacy Commissioners.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that since the Board of Lunacy Commissioners were instituted in 1845 the number of persons detained in lunatic asylums has increased from 26,516 to 119,829, while the number of paid Commissioners has remained the same; and whether, as the chief duty of the Commissioners is to see and interview, at least once a year, every person detained in a public or private asylum, in view of such increase, he will consider the advisability of adding to the number of the Commissioners.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I am afraid I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answer which I gave yesterday on this subject to the hon. Member for East Clare, which was to the effect that the whole question of the administration of the Lunacy Acts is engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government.

Scottish Fish Curing Industry.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department with reference to the evidence in the Factory Inspectors' Report for 1905, as to overcrowding, bad housing, and want of sanitary accommodation in connection with the Scotch fish-curing industry, what steps he intends to take in the matter.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: So far as the defects in question are remediable under the Factory Act special attention has been paid to them by His Majesty's Inspectors. The Secretary of State is in communication with the Scottish Office with the view to the possibility of action being taken by that Department in other directions.

MR. CATHCART WASON suggested that inquiry should also be made as to the insanitary condition of foreign ships carrying on the fish curing industry off the coast of the North of Scotland.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL expressed a doubt as to whether there was any power of control on those cases.

Hours of Florists' Assistants.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the successful prosecution of a firm of West End florists for employing women after legal hours, as reported on page 312 of the Factory Inspectors' Report for 1905, the premises of all such firms will, in future, be treated as workshops within the meaning of the Factory Act, and regularly inspected as such.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Florists' shops, as such, are no more under the Factory Act than other shops. They only fall within the provisions of the Act when, as in the case to which my hon. friend refers, processes of manufacture, adaptation for sale and the like, within the meaning of Section 149 are carried on. The Inspectors have instructions to inspect all places clearly coming within that section.

Architect to the Board of Lunacy Commissioners.

DR. COOPER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the architect appointed by the Board of Lunacy Commissioners to advise them on submitted plans for the erection or alterations of asylums is one who, in his private practice, is largely engaged in connection with such structures; whether he is in a position to give the name of the person who advises the Commissioners on the plans of asylums designed and erected under the superintendence of their architect; and whether he will consider the advisability of suggesting to the Commissioners the appointment of an architectural adviser, who shall give the whole of his time to the duties of the position.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I understand that the statement in the first part of the Question is substantially correct. The Commissioners inform me that they found it necessary to select as their adviser an architect who, from his personal experience, was thoroughly conversant with the requirements of such structures. When plans of asylums designed and erected under his superintendence are submitted for their approval, it is open to them to employ another architect to advise them in the matter. The question of modifying the existing arrangements, either by appointing a permanent architectural adviser attached to the Commissioners' Department, or otherwise, is at present under consideration.

DR. COOPER asked if there were not complaints of serious delay in regard to the passing of plans sent in by private architects cr by the architect of the County Council ?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that.

Court for Rating of Railway Appeals.

MR. BERTRAM (Hertfordshire, Hitchin): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of the Great Northern Railway Company (appellants) *v.* the Assessment Committee of the Hitchin Union and the Overseers of the Poor of the parish of Holwell (respondents), which was a test case to establish the basis of rating of railways in the Eastern Division of Hertfordshire; whether he is aware that owing to the absence of the chairman of the quarter sessions through ill-health and of the vice-chairman through disqualification by interest, the court consisted of three justices only, one of whom did not attend on all the days of hearing, and that after four sittings two members of the court, who were lawyers, arrived at widely different conclusions, and that the judgment was determined by the casting vote of the third justice, a layman; and whether His Majesty's Government will propose legislation to secure that in future proper arrangements may be made to constitute a court for dealing with issues of such importance of greater weight and numerical strength than that to which the case referred to has been submitted.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I have made inquiry and I find that the court was composed of three magistrates, the chair being taken by His Honour Judge Tindal Atkinson, a county court Judge of considerable experience, whose view was concurred in by Colonel Bruce Fellows. The final report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation contained a recommendation that the whole system of assessing railways should be altered, but I am not in a position to say whether His Majesty's Government will propose any such legislation. In any case, the necessary Bill would not fall within the province of my Department.

Cabinet Ministers' Traffic Passes.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department by whom the passes authorising a Cabinet Minister to take precedence for his carriage over other traffic in the streets of London are issued; and whether, in the event of these passes being abused by Ministers or their servants, there exists any means by which they may be withdrawn.

MR. LIDDELL (Down, W.): At the same time I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the offices held by Ministers who have Cabinet passes authorising them to take precedence for their vehicles over other traffic in the streets of London and elsewhere; by what authority, statutory or otherwise, these passes were issued; and, if there be no statutory authority for their issue, will he order that such passes be cancelled, and instructions given that no further passes of this character be issued to Cabinet Ministers or other subjects of His Majesty.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The passes referred to are issued by the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police to all the Cabinet Ministers as a matter of courtesy in pursuance of his general powers of regulating street traffic. There is, so far as I am aware, no statutory authority for the custom, which is one of old standing. The only privilege conferred on the holders is that of a special claim on the consideration of the police dealing with traffic, and precedence over other vehicles in certain circumstances. They confer no right whatever to contravene the Motor Car Act, or any other Statute or Statutory Regulation. No instances of their abuse have come to the notice of the Secretary of State, and he does not propose to issue any instructions for their withdrawal.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Why was the name of the Cabinet Minister concealed the other day?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Stansted Tuberculosis Experimental Farm.

MR. RAPHAEL (Derbyshire, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the tuberculosis experimental farm at Stansted, Essex, was sanctioned by the late Government for a period of three years only; will he say whether there has been any authorisation for its continuance, and, if so, for how long; is he aware that this tuberculosis experimental farm is intersected by footpaths and by three public roads, one of them being the main road between London and Newmarket; that the infected cattle and other animals feed and are burnt close to such roads, to the annoyance and danger of those using them; and whether he will cause such experiments to be confined to some more suitable area, and for such purposes will advise the purchase of a farm elsewhere, which could be re-sold when experiments have been concluded.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am not aware that any limitation of time was placed by the late Government on the use of the farms at Stansted. These farms are the property of Sir James Blyth, who in the first instance gave the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis the use of them, rent free, for three years, and has since most generously agreed to allow the Commission to continue in occupation on the same terms as long as may be necessary for the completion of their work. I understand that no public footpath passes through either farm, and that, though the main road runs close to both, the infected animals are kept in sheds at some distance from it. Their carcases are burnt in a specially constructed destructor, and there is, I am assured, no danger to the public. The present arrangement saves the country a considerable sum each year, and I do not propose to suggest that it should be altered.

Toxteth Relieving Officer.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, W. Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is yet in a position to make any statement on the subject of the appointment by the Toxteth Guardians of a man as relieving officer for Toxteth who was over the age specified in the advertisement and secretary of a Liberal club; and whether he has, in fact, in the meantime approved of such appointment.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I communicated with the guardians on this subject, and was informed that the person in question was one of six candidates selected out of 150 candidates by a subcommittee, that in the opinion of a majority of the guardians he was the most suitable applicant for the office, and that he was selected for this reason and not because he belonged to any political party. It was competent for the guardians to appoint a candidate whose age exceeded that mentioned in the advertisement if they thought fit to do so. I saw no sufficient reason for objecting to the appointment, and I have accordingly approved it.

Free Education.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether a parent has a right to claim free education for his child in a public elementary school; and, if not, whether he proposes to restore the right which was given by the Free Education Act.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Answer to the first paragraph of the Question is in the affirmative. I am not aware of anything which would suggest any need for the action proposed in the second paragraph.

Jarrow-on-Tyne Secondary School Fees.

MR. J. W. TAYLOR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the fees for scholars at the Jarrow-on Tyne Secondary School resident in the county of Durham are to be raised from threepence per week to 1s. 6d. per week; whether this is done by order from the Board of Education; and, if so, whether he will consider the question of modifying those charges with a view to meet the needs of working-class families.

MR. BIRRELL: The Board of Education have not yet been informed of the raising of the fee referred to in the Question. The Board have on more than one occasion intimated that such a change would seem desirable, but this advice is always given with the proviso that an adequate number of free places should be available in the school. The matter was fully explained to the Local Authority in the Board's letter of March 21st, 1905, and the hon. Member will find, I think, a clear statement of the principles adopted by the Board in this regard if he will peruse page xi. of the Prefatory Memorandum to the Board's Regulations for Secondary Schools, of which I am sending him a copy. The Board have the utmost concern for facilitating access to good secondary schools for the families referred to by the hon. Member, and their advice to local authorities is consistently directed to this end, and to the maintenance of a high level of efficiency in such schools.

Telegraphists' Scale of Work.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the number of staff necessary to perform the work of the larger telegraph offices throughout the Kingdom is determined on the basis of 24 messages per operator per hour; and whether he has any official reports showing that this method causes delay to important public traffic.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The number of the staff necessary to perform the work at telegraph offices is determined on an estimate of the total amount of the telegraph duties, manipulative and other, to be performed.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: Is it not based on 24 messages?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: No, on the total amount of work.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of my Question.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON was understood to ask for particulars of the cases referred to.

Press Message Delays.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether complaints have been made recently at Liverpool by newspaper owners of excessive delay in press messages received after six p.m.; whether over 100 items of press news have frequently been waiting over an hour at a time between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. before commencement of transcription; and, if so, will he say whether this is owing to the inadequate staff of operators.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am not aware of the circumstances stated by the hon. Member, but I will have inquiry made and will communicate the result to him.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: When may I expect that reply?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: As soon as I receive the information.

Promotions at Liverpool Telegraph Office.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will explain why recently at Liverpool a man was promoted overseer in the telegraph department over the heads of forty-one men senior to him; and will he say whether since this appointment the promoted overseer has been in charge of half-time learners and messengers, whilst one of the men passed over has been in charge of the tube and check section.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am making inquiry into the matter.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether at the time of the promotion of a telegraphist recently over the heads of forty-one of his seniors to the position of overseer, the man so promoted had been absent from the instrument room at Liverpool for nearly seven and a half years, whilst many of those passed over had performed overseer's duties on many occasions for some years; and whether the immediate superiors of the man so promoted were consulted on the appointment.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The appointment in question was made after due consideration of the facts of the case. The recommendations are in the first place made by the postmaster.

New War Office.

MR. THORNE: I beg to ask the Chief Commissioner of Works whether it is stated in the specifications for the building of the new War Office that all marble wanted for the work shall be dressed and worked on the works.

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): The Answer is in the negative. It would have been most objectionable to have stone and marble worked in the building; but the marble work, other than mantel-pieces, has been prepared at the contractors' workshops in London.

Kew Gardens.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if the rate of wage agreed upon by the Board of Works and the contractor is being paid on the painting contract in Kew Gardens; whether he will see that the workmen engaged on the dangerous parts of the large palm-house are paid the rate of wage paid for similar dangerous work; and, further, whether he will consider the advisability of sending an inspector from the Board of Works occasionally to superintend the carrying out of the contracts at Kew.

*MR. HARCOURT: There is in the contract no agreed rate of pay in measured work, but I understand that the contractor pays 7½d., except to leading men, who get 8½d. The wages paid in day work for painters who also act as glaziers is 8d. The schedule for daywork attached to the contract gives painters 8d., and glaziers 8½d., but it is stipulated that men engaged in day work on the upper main roof of the palm house shall be paid 25 per cent. in addition to their wages. The men are, I understand, satisfied with their rate of pay. The contract does not provide for any extra pay to the men for dangerous work, and none is paid, nor can I find that the men have asked for it. There is, however, an anomaly in this case, for if the painting were done in daywork, we should have to pay 25 per cent. on the wages; and the work being equally dangerous in measured work, the matter will be put right in the next contract. In answer to the third paragraph, I have to say that work at Kew is carried out under the supervision of the resident Clerk of Works.

Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, in view of the fact that the recently issued Report of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland shows that the ventilation of the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, is in an unsatisfactory condition, will he state what steps have been taken to remedy the evil.

*MR. HARCOURT: I am aware that the building is very imperfectly ventilated. I hope to have a scheme ready for consideration with next year's Estimates.

Ministry of Welsh Education.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Marylebone I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works what is the estimated cost, if any, of the new office accommodation for the Ministry of Welsh Education.

*MR. HARCOURT: No such estimate has been made, nor do I understand that any new office accommodation of the kind will be required.

Zoological and Botanical Gardens.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will say whether the Zoological Gardens and the Botanical Gardens in London, receive any grant from Parliament; and, if so, how much in each case; are these gardens open to the public daily, and what charge, if any, is made for admission; is it a fact that on Sundays they are only open to the fellows and their friends; and will he give the names of these gentlemen.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): Neither of the societies named receive any grant of public money. The Botanical Gardens are held under a lease from the Crown at a rent of £450 per annum, and under the lease—which expires in 1932—the lessees are bound to admit "all well conducted and respectably attired persons on payment of 1s." to the Gardens on not less than sixteen days during the month of May, June and July, and on not less than two days in every week during thirty-four weeks in the other months of the year. There is no special provision in the lease with regard to Sundays, and the Society is accordingly free to frame its own regulations for admission on these days. With regard to the Zoological Gardens I would refer the hon. Member to the answers which I have given on April 9th,† and May 2nd‡ to the hon. Member for Brixton. I have no information as to the names of the fellows of the two societies.

Licences on the Ecclesiastical Commission Estate.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the hon. Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, how many of the 336 places on the estates of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners which were licensed in 1905 for the sale of wine, beer, or spirits, were leased by the Commissioners direct to the person holding the licence, and how many were leased by them to brewers; and if he can say how many of the latter are tied houses.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland; for Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE): In a large number of these 336 cases the leases were granted by the Commissioners' predecessors in title, and as to these the Commissioners necessarily have not the information asked for. The remaining cases (of leases granted by the Commissioners) are mostly renewals, and on renewals the Commissioners invariably prefer the claims of sitting tenants. Without, however, an examination of all these transactions (ranging over a period of more than fifty years) it is not possible to say in how many cases the occupying tenants in fact took the leases. Moreover, if this were ascertained, the information would bear no necessary relation to the present facts, as houses originally let to the occupiers have doubtless been sold or mortgaged to brewers, and the leases of other houses may have been acquired by their occupiers.

School Water Supplies in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that there are eighteen schools in the island of Lewis in which the water supply is reported to be defective, will he state whether any steps have yet been taken to improve the supply; and, if not, the cause of the delay.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Local Government Board have been in communication with the Chief District Medical Officer of Health, who reports that he has been corresponding with local medical officers, the Lewis district clerk and the inspector of schools on this subject. The result of inquiries show that a gravitation supply is impracticable owing to the flat nature of the ground, and that sunk wells frequently yield water impregnated with iron. In this respect the supply is defective, but as I have already informed my hon. friend in answer to his Question on 25th June,§ in all cases good drinking water is available, but at too remote a distance, in the opinion of the medical officer, convenient for the use of the school children.

MR. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman press this matter so that the school children may get a supply of pure drinking water?

MR. SINCLAIR: Certainly: the matter shall not be lost sight of.

Shetland Herring Fishery.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, if he is aware of the feeling among the Shetland fishermen that it is essential to their interests that a close time for herrings should be established; and whether, in view of the importance of the question, he will obtain a Report on the position of affairs from the Scottish Fishery Board.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clv., 998.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clvi., 563.

§ See (4) *Debates*, clix., 658.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is understood the general feeling of the fishermen is not in favour of a close time. But in deference to the hon. Member's request I will ask the Fishery Board to report.

Shetland Herring Fishing and Whaling Operations.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that the whaling operations, as carried on in Shetland, cause apprehension of danger to the herring fishing; and if during the recess he will cause inquiry to be made into the working of the stations by the Scottish Fishery Board.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I may refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Departmental Committee which investigated this question in 1904. I am aware that such apprehension exists; but there has been no recent complaint against the working of the whaling stations.

Mr. CATHCART WASON suggested that a report up to date should be obtained, as there were recent complaints.

Unst School Board Grant.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been directed to the fact that through the inclemency of the weather and the absence of footpaths, the grant under Article B (6) of the Code has not been paid to the Unst School Board; and if he will, taking all the circumstances into consideration, sanction the payment of the grant for this year and until the paths are made for the children.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The matter has been referred to His Majesty's Chief Inspector, who is of opinion that, making due allowance for the circumstances mentioned, the attendance is by no means what it should be. The attendance of children living near the school is not properly enforced and it would seem, from the letters of the Board, as if they recognised no obligation to secure the attendance of any children who may be under seven years of age. In the circumstances, the reduction of grant cannot be remitted till the Board give more satisfactory evidence of their desire to secure a better attendance of children in these districts, where a better attendance is easily possible.

Perthshire Chief Constable.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether, in view of the duty of the police stationed in a burgh to report all burgh offences to the burgh procurator fiscal, he will state what steps he proposes to take to ensure that the chief constable of Perthshire reports all offences.

The LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs): No report has reached me that there has been any difficulty or failure of duty with regard to the reporting of offences in any burgh in Perthshire to the burgh procurator fiscal. Should such report be made, and be found to be well grounded, I should be glad to consider the situation, but it is right to point out that in ordinary circumstances such matters are for the consideration and determination of the sheriff of the county.

Irish Canals.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether arrangements have been made to add a member to the Royal Commission on Canals in respect to the Irish portion of the subject which is being inquired into; and when will this appointment be made and the name of the new commissioner announced.

Mr. McKENNA: The grounds of refusal are that all the facts are fully known, that they have been carefully examined and considered both by the Treasury and by the Board on more than one occasion in recent years, and that there is no reason to suppose that further inquiry would affect the judgment of the Treasury or of the Board of Inland Revenue.

Foreshore at Newcastle (County Down).

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that employees of Lord Annesley are in the habit at night time of removing sand, gravel, and shingle from the foreshore at Newcastle, county Down, in contravention of the lease granted to Lord Annesley by the Board of Trade; and whether, in the event of further breaches of the covenant, he will, in the public interest, determine the lease, which is held from year to year.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of TRADE (Mr.

KEARLEY, Devonport): The covenant in the lease to Lord Annesley provides that no sand or gravel shall be removed from the foreshore except with the consent of the Board of Trade. The Board recently gave their consent to the removal of a restricted quantity of sand and gravel after ascertaining from their expert advisors that it would cause no injury.

MR. SLOAN: Is it not the fact that the Department has frequently stated in answer to complaints that it has no control over the foreshore in county Down?

MR. KEARLEY was understood to reply that they had power.

MR. SLOAN said he had been in communication with the Board on the subject for two years, and had received letters to the effect that they had no power.

MR. KEARLEY asked the hon. Member to supply him with particulars and to discuss the matter with him.

MR. MACVEAGH: Have not the Board forbidden the removal of sand and gravel from the foreshore?

MR. KEARLEY: I am advised that that is the case.

Gortregan Postal Delivery.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the people of Gortregan, in the Borrisleigh postal district, county Tipperary, have no opportunity of posting letters later than 10.15 a.m., unless they go a distance of seven miles to the nearest post office; that the district is a populous one; that inconvenience exists there for the reasons mentioned; that the local creamery manager has to supply stamps to, and to cash postal orders for, the people of that district; and, if so, whether he will establish a sub-post office there without delay so as to enable the people to attend to their ordinary correspondence in a reasonable time.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I will make inquiry on the subject, and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result in due course.

Dublin Law Courts.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General if he can state how many special common jury and non-jury cases respectively, are now awaiting trial in the King's Bench Division; and how many special and common jury cases respectively, have been tried during the last month.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): I am not responsible for the regulation of business of the Courts, but I have obtained a Return which answers the right hon. Gentleman's Question. No. of Special Jury, Common Jury, and Non-Jury actions awaiting trial in the King's Bench Division:—Special Jury actions 169; Common Jury actions 220; Non-Jury actions 151. No. of Special Jury and Common Jury actions tried between the 26th day of June, 1906, and the 26th day of July, 1906:—Special Jury actions 14; Common Jury actions 6; Non-Jury actions none. Dated the 26th day of July, 1906.

Irish Passenger Trains.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state how the sum of £6,500 appearing under the heading, (H) Irish passenger train service, Vote 2, miscellaneous expenses at page 549, of the Appropriation Accounts 1904–5 is made up; how long has this grant been made; to whom is the money paid, and what is the exact object served by this expenditure.

MR. McKENNA: As shown at page 522 of the Civil Service Estimates for the current year, the annual payment of £6,500 is made to the London and North Western Railway Company in respect of the cost of accelerating the Irish passenger train service. The improvement of the service took effect on August 1st, 1898, and the payment has continued from that date. The need for an improved service had been strongly impressed on the late Government by Members from Ireland for the purpose of developing the tourist traffic and generally facilitating communication between England and Ireland. The matter was considered by a Departmental Committee, whose Report was published as Command Paper No. 9023 of 1898.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the so-called accelerated train is a slower train than the ordinary train?

Mr. McKENNA: Such as it is it was provided at the request of hon. Gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MOONEY: And you are paying the company £6,500 for a slower train?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Does the hon. Gentleman suggest that the Irish Members are responsible for that?

Mr. McKENNA: I must not be taken to accept the statement that it is slower.

Mr. MOONEY: I will send you the time table.

Mr. McKENNA: We make the payment in order to facilitate the special service for which hon. Members opposite had asked.

Viscount TURNOUR: Why not make a grant also to the Chatham and Dover Railway?

Mr. SLOAN: When payments of this kind are made does not the hon. Gentleman inquire into the results?

Mr. McKENNA: The matter was inquired into by an inter-Departmental Committee when the service was established. I will make further inquiries now.

Scottish Bills.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will reconsider his proposal as to the order of business for Saturday and put the Crofters Acts Amendment Bill down for the first Order, the day having been given for the introduction of that Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): I am afraid I cannot reconsider the order of business already announced for Saturday.

Mr. WEIR: As this sitting is to be purely Caledonian why not allow Scottish Members to decide this? Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that some of the Scottish Members are prepared to sit all night to pass the National Gallery (Scotland) Bill? Why not put it third then?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know that that is the unanimous view of the Scottish Members. It is not my view. I do not think it will take much time.

Mr. MORTON: Why not postpone it till the autumn session?

[No Answer was returned.]

Expiring Laws Continuance Act.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he proposes to introduce the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill during the present portion of the session.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: May I also ask the Prime Minister whether he will state when he intends introducing the Expiring Laws Continuance Act?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Not during this portion of the session.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of the expiring measures, the Irish Sunday Closing Act, will come to an end before Parliament reassembles in October? I will give the right hon. Gentleman notice of a Question on the subject.

Wages Boards Bill.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the extent of the sweating evil, he can see his way to give facilities during the autumn sitting for the consideration of the Wages Boards Bill, designed to establish minimum rates of payment in certain selected trades.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have already said that I cannot make any further promises of facilities and I am afraid I must abide by that.

The Partition of Bengal.

Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the closure of the debate on the Indian Budget last

Friday, he will give an opportunity to this House to consider the grievance of 45,000,000 of the King-Emperor's subjects due to the partition of the lower provinces of Bengal.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Before the Question is answered, may I ask the Prime Minister by recourse to what referendum, or by the exercise of what franchise, the opinion of upwards of fifty millions of illiterate peasants has been ascertained?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is much too big a question to be put in that casual way. My right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India has twice stated that His Majesty's Government regard the redistribution of Government in Bengal as a settled question. If any substantial grounds for reviewing this settlement are laid before him on good authority my right hon. friend will give them his careful consideration. But I am satisfied that after what has already been said a further discussion in this House is not likely to serve any useful purpose, and is not in the public interest.

Naval Bases.

MR. BELLAIRS (King's Lynn): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will consider the advisability of promoting an inquiry into the present cost and administration of the defences of naval bases with the view of reducing the garrisons and fortifications and promoting unity of control for naval purposes; and whether, for some years past, the War Office have been willing to hand over the administration to the Admiralty.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The strength of the garrisons of naval bases has recently been reviewed and considerable reductions have been made. The fortifications of all the ports at home have been lately reported upon by a Committee which is now extending its inquiries to the foreign stations. No useful purpose would be served by any further investigation at this period. The question of handing over the administration of the naval bases to the Admiralty has been considered by the Defence Committee; but at present it has not appeared advisable to transfer these duties to the Admiralty.

Scottish Pupil Teachers.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will see that no alteration is made by the Scottish Education Department with regard to pupil teachers until the Scottish Members of Parliament have had an opportunity of discussing the question in this House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: A copy of the Regulations dealing with the matter referred to by my hon. friend was laid on the Table on June 7th, and I am informed that the Regulations become operative one month from that date. The matter having already been discussed at some length, I do not consider an opportunity for further discussion necessary.

MR. MORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that we have had no opportunity of discussing this question?

[No Answer was returned.]

Public Trustee Bill.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT asked what course the Government proposed to take in regard to this Bill, in view of recent defalcation?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that the Government were exceedingly desirous of passing this Bill, the importance of which the hon. Member had not exaggerated. The Government intended to pass it this session, but he did not think that any further step could be taken during this portion of the session.

EDUCATION BILL—DIVISION ON CLAUSE 4.

MR. C. E. SHAW (Stafford) said that on looking at the Parliamentary Papers that morning he discovered that in one of the divisions last night he voted with the "Ayes," instead of with the "Noes," as he intended. He did not remember the division—he meant he could not recall having passed through the lobby—but he certainly did intend to vote for Clause 4 being made mandatory. He desired to know whether the vote could be transferred.

* MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member passed the tellers, and there is no method of correcting it unless he happened to vote in both lobbies.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Freeman Freeman-Thomas, esquire, for the County of Cornwall (South-Eastern or Bodmin Division).

SUPPLY [18TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

CLASS II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £38,566, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000. He wished to say that he was not actuated by any personal feelings. He had no feeling of emnity whatever against the Irish Local Government Board. He took the action he had done on public grounds and because he thought the Local Government Board in Ireland had not carried out the duties they were supposed to perform in a fair, reasonable, and satisfactory manner as public representatives. It was well to look at the *personnel* of this Board and observe how it was constituted. The Chief Secretary for Ireland was supposed to be the president of the Board, but he was president on paper only, and had no power whatever to alter any decision of the Board, because they would not allow him to use that power. He fancied the time was far distant when they would get a Chief Secretary in Ireland who would be strong enough to deal with this limb of the upas tree of Dublin Castle. The vice-president of the Board was Sir Henry Robinson. He did not know anything about Sir Henry Robinson personally, but he knew he belonged to that class in Ireland who had always steadily set out to prevent the people from ruling themselves fairly and reasonably. The Under-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant was another member of this Board. With regard to the present holder of this office, he did not desire to say anything at the present time. Very likely other hon. Gentleman would have a great deal to say about him. The Board was also composed of Mr. Micks and Dr. Stafford, very likely estimable men in their own way but not the men to whom the people of Ireland would look up as their representatives in the effort to obtain good government. Besides those he had mentioned there were also a whole host of underlings—he did not intend to weary the Committee by reading their names—every one of whom was drawn from a special class in Ireland, viz., the ascendency class, and woe betide the Chief Secretary who would put any other men in their places. In dealing with the question one naturally carried his mind back to those years immediately preceding the passing of the Irish Local Government Act of 1898. It was interesting to see what the relations were with the Local Government Board in those days. Every position of emolument was filled by the ascendency party; these public bodies were allowed to do as they pleased, and the authorities or their auditors very seldom, if ever, came down on them, whilst surcharges were almost unknown. But when the Local Government Act became law and the power of local representation was put into the hands of the people the old order of things was swept away and a new race of men stepped into the public life of Ireland; a race the great majority of whom had had nothing to do with the public work of Irish county or municipal life. He would take the case of his own city—Limerick. In the first municipal election held under the new Act the working men, feeling their power and determined to use it, elected, out of a possible forty, twenty-four labour representatives on the ancient Corporation of Limerick. Then members of the Unionist Party raised their hands in holy horror at the iniquity of the proceeding and prophesied that the new corporation would use their power in such a way that the Local Government Board would step in, relieve them of their powers, and send one of their own officials down to administer the city. All those prophets of evil were wrong. These working men—he was one himself—had not been educated at the universities or in high-class schools, but many of them had had a fair education and were all good sound common-sense, fairly intelligent men, and they tackled their work in a workman-like fashion and mastered all its details. Since that time, the elections had taken place, and the labour representatives had increased their numbers on the corporation. They decided, having four-fifths of the voting power in the city, that they were entitled to at least two-thirds of the representation. From the day those county councils and municipal and district councils came into power, the Local Government Board had set themselves to thwart their efforts in every way they could. This precious Board issued a ukase—talk about the Czar issuing a ukase! it was only milk and water compared with the ukase issued by Dublin Castle. They issued this ukase and told the representatives of the people that they would have to put it into force, and that if they did not do so they would be made by *mandamus* to enforce it. The majority of the public bodies in Limerick refused to put it in force, and, as a member of the Limerick Corporation, he had the pleasure of proposing the resolution refusing to have anything to do with the Public Bodies Order. Rightly or wrongly they believed that they were the inheritors of ancient powers and privileges and they determined jealously to guard them. The inevitable result was that the Local Government Board auditor went into all the accounts very closely of the Limerick Corporation, and he found fault wherever he could. When the corporation attended any public function the Mayor of Limerick was in the habit of issuing the usual invitations to the members of the corporation and the officials, but the Local Government Board auditor actually surcharged the mayor for doing this. The cost of the invitations amounted to only about 25s. The duty of the auditor was to see that the accounts were properly kept and that the contracts were carried out fairly, and it did not lie in the mouth of the auditor to surcharge the mayor for doing what had been done for many years past and for having followed a long established precedent. Those things only showed the bias of Dublin Castle. The corporation of Limerick paid £38 11s. for the auditing of the city accounts by one of the Local Government Board auditors, and that audit included the gas accounts and the accounts of the Technical Board. Owing to the large increase of business thrown upon the corporation of Limerick by the new Act, the auditor's fee was increased without any consultation whatever with the corporation of Limerick. This was done by sending down a sealed order which increased the auditor's fee to £60. Besides this, in the year 1905 the Local Government Board sent another sealed order, demanding £20 for the audit of the gas committee's accounts, and not only this, but they made the charge retrospective and charged £20 for 1904 and another £20 for 1903, making a total of £60. He might say that they had not paid that money yet, but it showed the way business was conducted. If the Local Government Board had an auditor's charge against the corporation in 1903 why did they not make their charge in that year? He hoped the Chief Secretary would see his way to stop this kind of thing. He suggested that some representatives of the Local Government Board should meet the corporation of Limerick and endeavour to make an arrangement satisfactory to both sides. But what they strongly objected to was increasing these charges by sealed orders, and he hoped that such orders would be swept away. All he could say was that if those orders continued to be issued, bad blood would be engendered. He hoped the local Government Board would cease to punish the Limerick Corporation and not continue to thwart their efforts until matters reached breaking point. Whatever was right and reasonable they were prepared to accept, but anything that the Local Government Board tried to force down their throats they would resist. Twenty years ago a powerful English Government tried to saddle the City of Limerick with a charge of £700 or £800 for extra police, but they had never yet paid a cent of it. If the Local Government Board went on as they were doing things could not work smoothly, and he might say that the case of Limerick was only typical of scores of other cases. He hoped the Chief Secretary would tell the Local Government Board plainly that they had gone quite far enough in these matters, and the line would have to be drawn somewhere, because even now trouble was brewing. If one corporation resolved to fight the Local Government Board they would find the great majority of the public bodies in Ireland ready to help them in their struggle for fair play. Before passing from the Public Bodies Order, he wished to say that all the asylums boards in Ireland had passed resolutions against this Order and were determined to fight it, because it would entail an enormous amount of expense upon them. Another portion of that Order which they objected to was the proviso that the minutes of the public bodies should be sent up for confirmation to the Local Government Board just as the minutes of boards of guardians had to be sent up. That was a thing which the public bodies in Ireland would never do, and the Local Government Board might as well recognise the fact. If their minutes had to be confirmed in that manner what did they want public representatives at all for? What use would public representatives be if they were simply made the tools and servants of the Irish Local Government Board? With regard to surcharges, for several years past the Local Government Board auditors sent down to Limerick had drawn attention in their reports to the expenditure in connection with the work of the city, and the expenditure which they grumbled most about was that spent upon cleansing the city and upon the wages paid to some of the hardest-worked men in England. When the public representatives came into power, they found these men working 365 days in the year, and they were receiving the munificent remuneration of 15s. per week. A corporation composed largely of working men, who knew what 15s. a week would do in a household, when they came into power one of the first acts they did was to cause an inquiry into this very department with a view to trying to alleviate in a small way some of the injustice under which this body of men suffered. The result was that they increased their wages by about 2s. 6d. a week per man, and for that act they had never been forgiven by the Local Government Board. Every auditor who came down to Limerick drew attention to the extravagance in regard to the wages of these poor men, but they never said a word about any increase in the salaries of the officials. They had a very efficient town clerk, and they resolved to pay him an extra £100 a year. He agreed that their town clerk was deserving of that increase, but what he wished to point out was that the Local Government Board auditor never grumbled at any increase in the salaries of officials, but when it came to a question of giving a couple of shillings a week more to these poor workmen in Ireland the auditor never failed to call attention to the extravagance of the Limerick Corporation in paying their labourers a wage which he did not agree could be called a living wage. He considered that anything under £1 per week was not a living wage at all. Then again surcharges were made because the Corporation gave their employees certain holidays. They could give the officials a month's holiday, but when it came to giving the night constables of the city a week's leave of absence, which did not mean an extra penny on the rates, because when those constables went off duty they went off in rotation, two at a time, and the beats were extended, and the other constables performed their work, the Corporation of Limerick were surcharged. They did the same thing with regard to the inspectors. With regard to the cleaning staff, who never got a holiday all the year round, they asked for a half holiday and guaranteed that instead of coming at 6 o'clock in the morning they would willingly come at 4 o'clock on the day they were permitted to have their half day's holiday, which really was only a quarter day's holiday. They allowed these poor men to have that holiday, but they were surcharged for it by the Local Government Board. The upshot of all this was that some months ago they decided to appeal against these surcharges in the King's Bench Division. After the case had been tried the Judges resolved that in two-thirds of the cases the corporation were within their rights in granting the holidays, and they disallowed the surcharges, but in the remaining third of the cases which referred to the poorest of their employees, they decided that the Corporation had not the authority to grant those men a half day's holiday for any purpose. The consequence was that there still remained a matter of £40 as a surcharge for these holidays, and it was levied upon poor members of the Corporation, two of whom were working men and one of them a business man in a small way, and none of them rich enough to bear this expense without its entailing a great hardship upon them. In the decision of the Court of King's Bench, when the costs came to be considered the Judges decided that each side should bear their own costs. In this case, however, it meant that the cost of the Local Government Board had to be levied on the rates of the City of Limerick. What beneficent laws those were to live under! He wondered that more Irishmen were not rebels! He felt sure that the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, if he lived in Limerick a little while, would soon become as big a rebel as himself. He hoped the Chief Secretary would break the web which entangled him in Dublin Castle. They had no desire to pull against the Local Government Board if they showed any desire to pull with them, and to treat the public bodies in a fair and friendly spirit. They did say, however, that as long as those boards were constituted as they were, they never would command the respect of the majority of the people. Why could not the Local Government Board be placed on the same footing as the Congested Districts Board or the Department of Agriculture? Those bodies had on them a certain number of officials, but they also contained a number of representatives elected by the County Councils of Ireland. The Technical Education Department also contained a number of publicly elected representatives, and the boards so constituted worked very harmoniously. If the time ever came when the Local Government Board was largely increased by the addition of elected public representatives from all portions of Ireland they would find that, north, south, east, and west, they would all pull together as they did upon the other boards which had been kept out of the arena of political strife, and instead of being a menace to the peace and prosperity of Ireland they would perform their functions with the full knowledge that they had the approval of the vast body of the representatives of Irish public opinion. He recommended that very strongly to the attention of the Chief Secretary. He was anxious that the public bodies in Ireland, consisting of public-spirited men, should be allowed to do their work without being hampered unduly, and that frivolous surcharges should not be continually hanging over their heads. When that time came these public bodies would not be brought before the gaze of English members who did not know the conditions under which the work was carried out in Ireland. On 24th May this year he asked the President of the Local Government Board—

> "Whether municipal borough councils and county councils have power to grant holidays or half holidays to their employees by resolution of such councils; and whether the Local Government Board have ever taken any action to deter publicly elected bodies from exercising such rights."

The answer of the President of the Local Government Board was very interesting and threw a curious light on the way in which the work was done here as compared with the way in which it was done in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman's answer was in the following terms:

> "It appears to me to be competent for these councils to provide in their agreements with their employees for reasonable holidays and half holidays being given to them. I am not aware that the Local Government Board have ever taken any action to deter publicly elected bodies from adopting this course."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,566, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Joyce.*)

*MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said this was a very important debate affecting the people of Ireland, and he regretted exceedingly that there was not a larger attendance of English Members to hear from representatives of Ireland a statement of some of the difficulties which beset the administration of local government in that country. In 1898 they all hailed with great pleasure the introduction of the Local Government (Ireland) Act. It was hoped and believed by all parties in the House that the passage of that Act would really, to quote an expression in the King's speech at the opening of Parliament, associate the people of Ireland with the local government of their country. He had no doubt whatever that if the intentions of the then Chief Secretary for Ireland had not been baulked by the permanent officials with whom he had to deal, and more or less upset from the very start by the permanent officials of the Local Government Board, many of those hopes would have been realised. But the right hon. Gentleman's views were utterly disregarded almost from the start by that Board, and so far from the measure bestowing more freedom and more power upon local authorities, the rules which were sanctioned by the Local Government Board under the Act really hampered those bodies more than they had been before, and turned many of the provisions of the Act from being a blessing almost into being a curse. That was a very strong statement to make. But he would call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to two salient results of the Act. The present Chief Secretary, who was a Member of the House in 1898, would remember that the Bill had two results. One was that the landlord class in Ireland were as a class to be relieved of further contribution to the local rating. The other was that every occupier of a holding, no matter what the valuation was, whether 1s., £1, or £100, was placed under the obligation of paying rates. That was to say the rich, or what might be called the well-to-do class of the Irish people, were to be free from the liabilities which they had previously to discharge, while the Act brought in the very poorest in the community, and compelled them to become contributors to the local rates. It would scarely be believed that by the operation of this arrangement thousands of poor people who were receiving outdoor relief because they were unable to maintain themselves out of their own resources, were actually asked to pay rates in Ireland; whereas the Earl of Longford, and landlords like him, who had previously been large contributors to the rates, escaped practically scot free. This was especially so in the case of non-resident landlords. That state of things proved conclusively that the measures passed in this House for the benefit of the people of Ireland were almost invariably rendered absolutely nugatory or destroyed at the outset, and that what might be good and useful measures to meet the wishes and the wants of the vast majority of the people of Ireland were turned into something little better than a curse to the people they were designed to serve. Immediately after the responsibility of the landlord class was removed from them and placed on the people, what happened? An artificial agitation was got up in Ireland for an increase of every form of expenditure by the public bodies. There was a complete reversal of the nursing system. Every workhouse was visited by a Commissioner with the view of finding out the defects in the local nursing arrangements and medical treatment. He did not propose to argue that it was not a right and good thing to do all that was possible to alleviate the condition of the poor people who had to live in those wretched institutions—the Irish workhouses. The point he wished to impress on the Chief Secretary was that while the landlords were paying their contribution to the rates there was nothing at all said about the wants and the woes and the miseries of that class, but the moment the people as a whole became responsible for this enormous volume of expense they first heard of these defects. He would give an example to show what he meant. In the Union in which he lived the nursing arrangements had existed for sixty years before the passing of the Local Government Act, and the cost was something like £40 a year. Immediately this agitation was put on foot the Local Government Board issued its fiat, and the old system of nursing gave place to a new system which cost the ratepayers in the Longford Union £500 a year. The moment this order of the Local Government Board was given a ring was formed among the nursing staffs in Dublin, and no nurse could be obtained by any public authority for less than from £50 to £60 a year. No matter what the qualifications of the former nurses were, they could not be allowed to do more than sweep the ward unless they had a special diploma from the select ring in Dublin. The result was that the local bodies had been held up to contempt in the eyes of the people for increasing the cost of administration. The local bodies had been compelled under the threat of suspension in some cases to accept nurses from Dublin at the high figures, though the former nurses, who had served faithfully and well had qualifications quite as good. That was only one instance, but he could give numerous other instances in which this question of expensive management was insisted upon by the Local Government Board, and as a consequence the cost of local administration had steadily gone up. The right hon. Gentleman knew as well as he did that even when the Local Government Board was under the administration of the right hon. Member for Dover and the right hon. Member for South Dublin, report after report made by the Local Government Board showed that local administration was honestly and efficiently conducted; that these bodies had brought to the discharge of the new duties imposed upon them considerable ability and a spirit of fair play which commanded the admiration of even those who were opposed to him. But the cost of administration went up and at the same time the landlords escaped from paying their fair share of it. What followed? The Local Government Board increased its staff. He had no objection at all to the proper staffing of the public offices. They should receive every facility for the discharge of their duties; but this increase of the staff offered an opportunity to place every political *protegé* of the then Government in office. He ventured to say that since 1898 till the present Government came into power, these offices had been filled by men who had little or no official competence for the discharge of their duties and whose sole qualification was that they were the sons of some favourite of the powers that then ruled in Ireland. When the Local Government Act was passing through the House, an Amendment was moved that the auditors under the Act should be chartered accountants of Ireland—men who would be in sympathy with the business people of Ireland and of proved ability. But that Amendment was not accepted by the then Government, and the inspectorships and auditorships became the gift of Dublin Castle. It was notorious that two or three of these particular gentlemen so appointed set themselves from the start to be as offensive as could be to the new local bodies created under that Act. He did not wish under the privilege of the House to make a personal attack on any particular one of these gentlemen, but it was perfectly well known that at least three of them were totally unfitted to fulfil the duties of auditor, and that they had brought the Local Government Board into conflict with the representatives of the people by small mean points on which they had surcharged the elected representatives of the local bodies. Let their conduct be contrasted with the conduct of the old staff. For nearly forty years the brother of the ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Captain William Gibson, of Roscrea, was auditor of the county which he represented, and during all that time he never came into conflict with any of the local bodies, but had always discharged his duties fairly and honestly. But a Major Eccles was sent along as auditor, whose chief qualification was that he never saw a battle except on paper, and his reports on the administration of the local authorities were ridiculous. Then came a Mr. King, whose qualification was some recommendation from a Member for an Ulster constituency, who likewise made himself most objectionable to the local authorities. He warned the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, that if the working of the local government of Ireland was to go on smoothly and if there was to be mutual confidence between the central body and the local bodies, then those gentlemen who interfered with the local bodies in a snubby and insulting manner in regard to surcharges ought to be curbed. He came to another aspect of the case. When the Local Government Act of 1898 came into operation power was given to the Local Government Board to make rules; and they exercised that power by issuing an order on December 24th, 1899, in which they prescribed certain forms of book-keeping. Those forms were of a highly technical and complicated character; and he remembered exhibiting one of them which would have covered half the floor of the House. What was the result? An addition to the clerical staff of the county council—all which involved additional expense. But in 1904 a new set of forms were issued by the Local Government Board — in one of which there were no fewer than forty-six different columns to be filled in in connection with only one transaction! Then there was another in connection with the register of public works which had to be filled in with thirteen columns, and still another with sixteen columns. In fact what evidently was wanted was that the whole history of every boreen in Ireland should be kept as a kind of chart for the guidance of Local Government clerks in the Dublin Customs House. That was an utter absurdity and an absolute waste of time and money; and it added immensely to the cost of local government in Ireland. To prevent such waste heretofore was like spitting against the wind and there was no result. The right hon. Gentleman and his advisers had made up their minds to impose this upon them, and the local district councils had expressed their opinion without any effect, and the proposal was shoved down the throats of the people. It involved the keeping of a wholly new set of accounts in the district. The right hon. Gentleman would say, quite fairly and properly, "How can I help it?" But he (Mr. Farrell) said that even now something could be done. There was no harm in calling the attention of the right hon. Gentleman and of a new democratic and Radical Government to these matters, and to show them the result of the bureaucratic action in Dublin, and what these sudden changes instituted by the Local Government Board or the Treasury involved in regard to questions of local government. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would admit that wherever there were changes of this character made, the fullest consideration should be given to the views of the local bodies. The unfortunate thing was that the late Government refused to listen to the views of the representatives of Ireland, and this policy had impeded and retrograded the progress of their legislation. There was one blot upon the local government of Ireland which he would fain not mention because it affected himself. Certain rules had been issued under the Act of 1898 in regard to what was called the disqualification section. It was laid down that a person should be disqualified from serving upon certain local bodies if within five years before his election or since his election he was convicted, either on indictment or by summary jurisdiction, of any offence and was sentenced to any term of imprisonment with hard labour without the option of a fine. In 1902 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover re-imposed coercion in Ireland, and a number of gentlemen who supported the Nationalist movement in Ireland were sent to prison for various terms. Amongst others, he was sentenced on appeal by Judge Curran to three months imprisonment with hard labour for having published in his paper certain reports of the proceedings of the United Irish League to which the Government took exception. In consequence of this conviction he was removed from his office of county councillor, district councillor and member of the board of guardians, and this extrarodinary anomaly remained that while he could not remain a member of those local bodies, he could still have the honour of being a Member of the British House of Commons. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to look into this disqualification section and see whether there could not be some amendment of it which would remove from the scope of its operation persons who were convicted of political offences. He was quite sure that everybody would agree that what he was convicted of was a political offence and that disqualifications of this sort in such a case should not be insisted upon. It was a travesty of this section as originally framed to apply it to persons convicted of political offences. He was not the only sufferer, as there were twenty-four persons removed from public positions, because the authorities enforced the decisions of two removable magistrates in every case. It might be said that this was a matter which could only be dealt with by legislation, but he did not think that plea could be sustained, as in his judgment all that was required was an Order in Council. This course was taken not under the operation of the Local

Government Act itself, but under some power conferred by that statute to make rules. It was an outrage that those who were elected as representatives of the people and who were convicted of political offences at the instance of their political opponents should be treated in the same way as those who were convicted of ordinary criminal offences. Another matter which he would like to draw attention to was the appalling increase of the expenditure in regard to lunatics in Ireland. He earnestly entreated the right hon. Gentleman to use his good offices with the Treasury with a view of relieving the ratepayers of this terrible burden. In anything he had said he had no desire to make the position of the Chief Secretary, who was nominally responsible for the present condition of things, more difficult, because he perfectly realised that it was almost impossible for the right hon. Gentleman or any other Chief Secretary to fulfil all the duties of his office, but he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would do what lay within his power to make the officials feel that they were not the masters but the servants of the people.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that many of the boards which dealt with matters involving their coming into contact with the daily life of the Irish people did not possess the confidence of the population. There was no board of which this was more true than the Local Government Board. There was hardly a member of the Irish Local Government Board and hardly an official who could put up for any position in the gift of the people with any chance of success in any part of the country. The Local Government Board had it in their power to simplify the wants and help the local authorities. On the other hand they could be captious critics. There was a vast difference between the systems in this country and in Ireland. Here the Board and its officers as a rule endeavoured to assist the people, and were in sympathy with them to a large extent, because appointments were made on merit, and not given merely to political partisans. In Ireland the members of the local bodies who were sent to the Board were checked and counterchecked in a faultfinding way, and of course nothing whatever could be done without the consent of the Board. He, like everyone else, welcomed the change which had been made in the work of local government, but he considered it suspicious that the officials were now so zealous in finding hitches, whilst before 1898, when the landlords had to bear a share of the rates, they were so idle. That certainly was a suspicious circumstance. Let him mention one instance of the attitude of the Board. In relation to the erection of labourers cottages the Local Government Board required certain things to be done. Why did they not supply to the local authorities plans and particulars of the kind of cottages that they approved of, instead of allowing the local bodies to have to go to the expense of advertising for plans and specifications. The fact was that instead of trying to make matters easy for the local authorities the Board and its officials had endeavoured by every means in their power to thwart them. Proof of this was to be found in the class of men who were sent about the country to surcharge the local bodies in every direction. It was a curious state of things that a man convicted by two removable magistrates of an offence which was not an offence in any other country, should be debarred from serving his country on a local body and yet be allowed to sit in this House. He would not further occupy the time of the House. He had no intimate personal knowledge of the working of this Act, but from what he could see the system adopted by the Local Government Board in Ireland was a system of harassing the representatives of the people.

*MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.) said he wished to supplement the remarks which had been made with respect to the inspectors of the Local Government Board, but before he did so he desired to say he did not agree with the reason given for their action. He thought the reason was a deeper one. All the present bodies were representative bodies, elected on the broadest franchise, whilst the old grand juries were nominated, representative only of one class in Ireland. That was the reason why the officials of the Board who did not interfere in the old days did so now. He might be permitted to read an extract from the

Local Government Board Report of 1900. In speaking of the work of the new bodies under the Local Government Act this passage occurred—

> "The councils generally have dealt in a proper and business-like manner with questions coming before them, and the new system of county government in Ireland was inaugurated very successfully."

In the next Report, that for 1902, there having been none issued for 1901, they said—

> "Our further experience enables us to confirm the statement in our last Report as to the satisfactory manner in which the duties of the county councils and rural district councils have been discharged."

In 1903 they said—

> "The general system of accounts devised has withstood every test."

That was before the Public Bodies Order was framed. That Order was a most intricate document, consisting of 160 pages. He thought the Report of the Local Government Board for 1903 was the strongest justification for the action of the county councils, the rural councils, and the borough councils of Ireland, in regard to this Order. The Order was issued without giving the county councils concerned any opportunity of studying it or of making any remarks or suggestions whatever upon it, and was entirely uncalled for. That in itself was not a constitutional action on the part of a bureaucratic institution like the Local Government Board of Ireland. Such an action would not be dreamt of by the Local Government Board of England, which was always amenable to public opinion, no matter what Government was in power. But they all knew that public opinion in Ireland did not count at all, except the opinion of the narrow section known as the British garrison. He desired specially to refer to the questions at present at issue between the Local Government Board and the Richmond District Lunatic Asylum, of the Committee of Management of which he was a member. He believed that this Public Bodies Order, in so far as it referred to the Richmond district asylum, was *ultra vires*, because according to the Local Government Act of 1898 the power to make rules was given to the joint Committees, and not the Local Government Board, and the Lord-Lieutenant alone had the power to sanction any order or rules governing the asylums. Under the Local Government Act of 1898 all the asylum management committees in Ireland were obliged to make new rules and submit them to the Lord-Lieutenant for his sanction. When the new management committee of the Richmond District Asylum came into office they at once set to work to frame a set of rules, which the Lord-Lieutenant subsequently sanctioned. That committee held that these rules could not be set aside except by the Lord-Lieutenant. But the Local Government Board came along with the Public Bodies Order and endeavoured to upset those rules that were then, and still were, the law in his opinion. And in his opinion the action of the Local Government Board in this respect was *ultra vires*. The Richmond District Asylum Committee represented the County Borough of Dublin, the County of Dublin, the County of Louth, and the County of Wicklow, each of which had sent to the committee some at least of the ablest members of those bodies representing every political party and every class. By one of their Orders the Local Government Board had endeavoured to make the resident medical superintendent the Secretary to the managing committee, and to make him responsible for every detail in the working of the chief clerk's department, the accountancy work, the duties of the storekeeper, and every minor detail of administration in the institution This the Committee declined to agree to. This was only one of the absurdities in the Order issued. A correspondence ensued between the committee and the Local Government Board early in 1905, and was carried on to the end of the year, but before the result was arrived at a *mandamus* was applied for to compel the committee to carry out the Public Bodies Order in its entirety. The Local Government Board consented to almost everything

Mr. Cogan.

MR. T. L. CORBETT called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

House counted, and forty Members being present, the debate was resumed.

*MR. COGAN thought that the position taken up by the Chief Secretary so far as the Local Government Board in Ireland was concerned, in inviting these public bodies to have recourse to the Law Courts on every question at issue between them and the Local Government Board, was a little bit far fetched. Many of the actions of the Local Government Board had been proved in Court to be illegal, and his hon. friend the Member for Limerick had shown conclusively that two-thirds of the surcharges they had made as affecting the Limerick Corporation were illegal. He considered that the Local Government Board had been guilty of a gross breach of public faith in reference to its treatment of the Richmond District Asylum Committee, because they actually went into Court and got their conditional order of *mandamus* made absolute against that committee without giving them any notice. He submitted they ought not to receive that kind of treatment from a body of which the Chief Secretary was the President. Month after month the Local Government Board had insisted upon one particular Order affecting the medical superintendent of the Richmond Asylum being carried out, although they had previously, under their own hand and seal, conceded this point. They had now withdrawn that concession under the *mandamus*, and they were still insisting upon making the medical superintendent responsible for the keeping of accounts which he never saw and in regard to which he was being called upon to declare—

> "I hereby certify that the figures shown in this statement are correct."

How could this gentleman certify that those figures were correct unless he prepared them himself? In the case of English asylums he found that the accounts were certified and the correspondence conducted by the clerk. He put a Question to the Home Secretary not long ago, and he was informed that this was the practice in English asylums. The Richmond Asylum District Committee had refused, and would continue to refuse, to submit to this ukase, because they believed that they had the law upon their side, although a *mandamus* had been made absolute behind their back. He wished to emphasise one or two points which had been referred to by his hon. friends who had preceded him. As to the Order issued by the Local Government Board with respect to accounts, almost all county councils, borough councils and rural councils, protested against it, on the ground not only of the unnecessary cost, but also of the extra amount of time and labour involved in the working of it out. The change which was made by that Order was quite uncalled for and indefensible. His hon. friend the Member for North Longford had referred to the grievance in connection with the question of rating. Under the Local Government Act every occupier of a house was liable to pay rates, however small the rent might be. The same statute provided that the landlords were bound to refund the rates, but they knew how that worked out in practice. The landlords did not refund the rates. Even poor people living on outdoor relief had to pay rates, and that was a point which required amendment. He had been endeavouring by means of Questions to get a settlement of a difficulty whch had arisen in connection with finance on account of the change of the end of the financial year from December 31st to March 31st. At the time the change was made in 1899 there was a hiatus of three months in respect of which the county councils had not received the payments for the maintenance of pauper lunatics to which they were entitled out of the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account. They had, therefore, been obliged to rate the people for the whole cost of the maintenance of lunatics for these three months. That was a great hardship for the people to suffer, for it involved a sum of £37,030. He did not think the ratepayers should be asked to bear that. The Chief Secretary had said that it was too late to remedy it now. But it was not through any fault on the part of the Irish representatives that it had not been remedied earlier, for they had been endeavouring since 1899 to get it remedied. He would ask the Attorney-General to bear this in mind, and to see whether something could not be done to have the money paid out of the local taxation account or to give relief in some other way.

*MR O'DOWD (Sligo, S.) called attention to the relationship between the Local Government Board, as a supervising body, and the various local bodies created by the Act of 1898. He would deal with this matter on general grounds rather than in detail. Having had experience of public boards in Ireland for the last fifteen years his own opinion was, and he thought it would be generally admitted by those who knew the conditions which obtained in regard to the matter of local government, that as a supervising authority the Local Government Board was utterly incompetent to deal with the complicated machinery set up by the Act of 1898. Previous to the passing of that Act the grand juries, consisting of non-representative men, did all the fiscal business of the counties and were responsible for local government. The Baronial Sessions, composed of magistrates and associated ratepayers, also a non-representative body, did the work so ably discharged now by the district councils of Ireland, work which, notwithstanding the hampering conditions of the Local Government Board, had won tributes of applause from their enemies. These bodies ruled in the interest of the classes, and not of the masses. At that time the Local Government Board was a paragon of economy, although Grand Jurors might have demesne walls erected along their residences at the public expense. Barony constables in those days of corruption were appointed by the Grand Juries. It was their duty to collect the cess and they were paid 1s. in the £ for such collection. But they got a subordinate officer to do the work and assume all the responsibility at 3d. in the £, whilst they for doing nothing at all pocketed 9d. in the £ on the gross collection, and it must be remembered that these barony constables were as a rule employees of the rent office. Local Government was conducted in the interest of the landlords who were liable for half the rates. The members of the Local Government Board were landlords themselves, and they acted as the custodians of the landlords' interests. When the network of local bodies created by the Act of 1898 came into operation the Local Government Board immediately changed its tactics and they endeavoured to enforce their will and their wishes on the poor law unions against the views held by the representatives of the people. The opinion of the officers of the Board seemed to be that the elected representatives were not competent to judge of the requirements of their own districts. He did not want to attack any individual member of the Local Government Board, but he would give one instance of their action. He knew of a workhouse which was erected at an enormous cost to accommodate 900 paupers, and for the last fifty years that workhouse had on an average only 100 inmates. Under the old *regime*, he being at that time chairman of the board of guardians suggested that, under the Act of 1898, a portion of this immense building should be utilised as an auxillary lunatic asylum. The recommendation to that effect to the Local Government Board was ignored; and after being put off for some time the board of guardians were told that the thing could not be done. He maintained that under the new system of local government, the Local Government Board was utterly incompetent to regulate the local bodies in Ireland. At the same time, with all the imperfections on its head, he must admit that the Local Government Act of 1898 was a good Act, although there might be some blots upon it, and although its operation had been hampered by the foolish and ridiculous Orders issued by the Local Government Board. The Act had won the approval of the people, and had been carried on in the main satisfactorily. He insisted, however, that the Local Government Board as at present constituted was unable properly to supervise the working of the Act of 1898. The remedy was the reform and the reconstitution of the Local Government Board with an element of popular representation on it. By that means they would at least ensure that the local government of the country was properly administered. He had been chairman for seven years of a county council and although he had no complaint to make against any individual official of the Local Government Board, he held that the officials as a whole were out of touch with the people. They were the nominees practically of the landlords and the Unionists. They were appointed, not because of their worth or their merits, but because they were the sons of their fathers. When these officials went down to visit a workhouse or asylum and they made any recommendation, objection was at once taken if the guardians failed to comply with their suggestions. That was a very unhappy state of affairs, and there was only one remedy for it, viz., the reform and the re-constitution of the Local Government Board and the introduction of an element of popular representation.

Mr. NOLAN (Louth, S.) said that he felt that criticising the local administration of Ireland was like throwing water on a drowned rat. He did not suppose that there was anyone acquainted with the condition of affairs in Ireland who would do reverence to that unclean thing, Dublin Castle; and he hoped that the right hon. the Chief Secretary would be able to give the Committee the gratifying assurance, not only to the Irish Members, and the Irish people, but to every Englishman who had respect for the good fame of his country, that the whole thing would be swept away soon, and something instituted in its place which would be representative of the interests and the wishes of the people of Ireland. This last week they had had in London a large number of gentlemen connected with the representative institutions, more or less advanced in character, of the various countries of the world. They had also heard of a great Empire, the population of which was prepared to deluge their country with blood in order to secure Parliamentary representative institutions. If one of those gentlemen had been present in the House that evening and had listened to this debate, what would he say when he found that under our Parliamentary institutions in one of the oldest cities in Ireland, the members of the municipality could not give a day's holiday to one of their employees engaged in hard work for 365 days in the year without being surcharged for it, and having to pay the employee's wages out of their own pockets. Instances of that kind could be multiplied. In the chief town of his constituency, the town of Drogheda, when an allowance was given to a hard-working employee who had been many years in the service of the corporation, when he was no longer able to perform his duties, the auditor of the Local Government Board called upon the members of the corporation to pay the money out of their own pockets! And this was under the free Parliament of Great Britain! He hoped the Chief Secretary would be able to assure them that they had come to the end of this state of affairs which surely had lasted long enough and which had brought great misery upon Ireland. He desired to call attention to a grievance which he said existed in his own constituency in regard to the appointment of medical officers to look after the sick poor. In a district which was twenty-five miles long there were originally three of these medical officers. One of them died, and the Local Government Board in its wisdom said that no one should take his place. Considering the size of the district it was not necessary for him to dwell upon the hardships inflicted upon the sick poor in consequence of this decision, because it involved in some cases their having to travel twelve or fourteen miles in order to obtain medical relief. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover promised to look into the matter but it had never been dealt with. This was not a question which had anything to do with political Parties, because a meeting held on the subject was attended by gentlemen of every shade of political opinion and of religion. The Catholic priest and the Protestant clergyman were present, as were also magistrates, the neighbouring gentry and representatives of the labourng poor. With one voice they all pronounced against this proceeding of the Local Government Board and asked that the old state of affairs should be restored. It appeared, however that the clerk who represented the Local Government Board in the district had more power in his pen than all other people put together. He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover in his term of office had dealt with the matter in a courteous spirit, but the immediate predecessor of the Chief Secretary would not hear of any change. Consequently a very unhappy state of things prevailed in the district, the wishes of the ratepayers were flouted and unnecessary hardship was inflicted upon the sick poor.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) called attention to the subject of the boarding-out of pauper children. He was a great believer in the system. He asked the Chief Secretary to consider whether it would not be possible, in conjunction with Irish local government, to adopt the system on a much larger scale than heretofore. Boarding-out was looked upon with favour in every part of Ireland, the condition of pauper children in the workhouses being anything but what it ought to be. In his opinion there should be no pauper children in the workhouses; they should all be boarded-out. He also called attention to the unequal incidence of the grant-in-aid of Irish administration as between different counties. The hon. Member for one of the divisions of Wicklow had spoken of the grant. All he would say with regard to that was that they had been deprived of three months of that grant and it would be only just and fair on the part of the Local Government Board to make that good. The last question to which he would refer was that of vagrancy. Vagrancy had been growing for some years in Ireland until it had reached very serious proportions. In Ireland there had grown up an indigenous race of loafers who would no nothing and who had never done anything. Under the existing law these people obtained their board and lodging every day at the various workhouses and did not even earn anything in return for the ratepayers' money which was spent upon them. Hon. Members would see from the Report of the Vagrancy Committee which considered this question that as long ago as 1894–1895 the average number of these tramps relieved weekly was 5,000, or 17 per 1,000 of the whole population of Ireland, and unfortunately under the existing conditions the poor law guardians could not cope with them in such a way as to insure that they should do a certain amount of work for the relief that was given to them. The Report also pointed out that this class was unknown in the West of Ireland, but that in the East and South these tramps abounded and practically blackmailed the people of those districts and terrorised them into giving them either food or money in order to get rid of them. There was a general feeling throughout the country that this question ought to be dealt with and that this growing evil ought to be put a stop to. That being so, he desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary whether it was not possible to consult with the Irish Local Government Board with a view to finding a remedy for a state of things that had become intolerable.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary S.) said although he had no hostility towards any member of the Irish Local Government Board he had a most determined hostility to the institution itself. It was, in his opinion, absolutely useless for the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to think he could amend that institution in any way whatever. The only remedy was to root it out entirely and have a new Board. Unless it was absolutely cleared out no good whatever would be done. After what had been said by his hon. friends the right hon. Gentleman must realise in what a hopeless state the government of Ireland was at the present moment. The hon. Member for one of the divisions of Wicklow had called attention to the deputation which had waited on the Chief Secretary with reference to the Wicklow Asylums Committee dispute and to the reply that they must go to the Court; so it was in nearly every case. The answer was always the same, they must go to a Court of law. That was a monstrous state of things and one which any Government and any Party ought to be ashamed of. Then there was the case referred to by the hon. Member for Limerick of the Limerick Corporation which was now fighting the Local Government Board. This big action was going on in Dublin at the present moment, though he contended it was in the power of the Chief Secretary and the Government of Ireland to deal with this and other matters and that there was no need to go to the Court at all. Some time ago the auditor who audited the accounts of the Tipperary Urban Council surcharged the council the sum of £159 10s. The Tipperary Urban Council communicated with the Local Government Board and received in reply a rather uncivil letter which showed that the Local Government Board were siding with their auditor. The Tipperary Urban Council then took proceedings in the Court of King's Bench and the learned Chief Baron in a most scathing judgment quashed the surcharge and stated that the auditor had acted illegally and exceeded his powers. Yet notwithstanding the fact that he got rid of the surcharge he was powerless with regard to the costs, and had to order the Tipperary Urban Council to pay not only their own costs but also the costs of the auditor. He (Mr. Cullinan) brought the case to the attention of the then Chief Secretary in this House, the right hon. Member for Dover, in whose opinion the case was so bad that he at once relieved the urban council of the whole liability. He contended that the right hon. Gentleman ought not to allow the Local Government Board auditors to trample on the Corporations of Dublin and Limerick in the way they were doing. There was another case in which he and two others were interested, where the local body was surcharged a sum of £279 for among other things medicines and disinfectants which were procured for the district, there being an epidemic, at the express order of the medical officer of the Local Government Board. That circumstance was brought to the attention of the auditor who revised the audit and made the surcharge £69. He then wrote to say that the £69 should be paid at once, otherwise proceedings would be taken to recover it. When he (Mr. Cullinan) investigated the matter he found the first item charged against the local authority was the very first item which he had called the attention of the auditor to as having been procured by the direct order of the Local Government Board. He drew attention to these matters in order to show how necessary it was for the Chief Secretary and the Irish Government to take action. He found in the Estimates that a number of inspectors were employed. The chief inspectors received from £500 to £700 a year, besides a guinea a night and 7s. a day travelling expenses. The inspector-auditors received £900 a year, and the auditors £400 a year besides expenses. This question of the enormous salaries and travelling expenses paid to these officials which were included in the Estimates, besides which the public bodies of Ireland were called upon to contribute to the cost, was one which the Government ought to look into. In the Order relating to county surveyors those officials were practically asked to devote their entire time to clerical work. One of the extraordinary items in the Order was that a county surveyor was not to get any implements necessary for carrying on his work without a special order from the county council (which met quarterly), so that he could not buy spades or anything else in the event of an accident which necessitated the removal of an obstruction. The Orders were so ridiculous that he was surprised the public bodies throughout Ireland had not taken action against them. He asked whether where cases of hardship and injustice to the public bodies and ratepayers were shown the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary and the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney-General ought not to exercise their own sense and judgment instead of leaving it to a Court of law.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.) said that hon. Members failed to recognise two points in connection with the duties of the Local Government Board. In the first place, the Board's duties were imposed by statute. The Board had been spoken of as some malignant fairy that had stepped in, if he might mix the metaphor, "off its own bat" to give trouble to local bodies who were getting on very nicely. The trouble, of course, was that Parliament had laid on the Board a large number of obligations, which hon. Members ought to study before they criticised the endless complication which they charged the Board with introducing. In the second place, why was the Board there? It was there to protect the ratepayers. The local authorities were excellent bodies, which had, on the whole, done their work well. It was generally felt that the county councils consisted of capable and zealous men who enjoyed the confidence of their fellow citizens, that they took a good deal of pains in their work and did it in an honourable and impartial spirit. There might be exceptions here and there, but, speaking generally, that was the testimony he got from men who would be called by some the ascendancy party. They paid a willing tribute to the general excellence of the work. But still it was true that members of all local authorities were under a certain amount of pressure. They were under pressure from the friends of their employees and sometimes from the employees themselves and they had sympathies. There were people among their constituents who had got particular objects which they desired to attain, and they therefore required—it was no great impeachment to them for it was true of all—required to be guarded against themselves. It was sometimes well that they should feel that they were not absolute masters of the expenditure of the rates, but that they had to render an account for the way in which the rates were expended. What was the business of the Local Government Board? To see that the interests of the ratepayers were safeguarded and to see that no payment was made for which there was not statutory authority; to see that the money went to the objects to which Parliament desired it to go. And therefore the Local Government Board was often obliged to interfere in the interests of the ratepayers, and sometimes it was obliged to interfere through its officers in cases where it was subsequently convinced that a discretion might be given to the local authority and where it thought it could dispense with the obligation which had been given in certain cases. He dared say it sometimes happened that a case was made out to the Local Government Board in which they said—

> "We do not think that the local authority is to blame in incurring this expenditure. We think this is a case in which they perhaps ought to have been allowed to do it."

But they could not overlook the words of the statute without weakening the respect which ought to be paid invariably to the law. Therefore there were cases in which the Local Government Board, where it might be desirable to exercise a discretionary power, had done so. Let those general considerations be borne in mind before they came to deal with the particular misdeeds which were charged against the Local Government Board by the hon. members who had spoken. He would like before he came to those matters to acknowledge on behalf of the Board that there had been no manifestation of personal hostility to any one of its members by name, and certainly not to the four members of the Board who were themselves the directing parties. He knew the three members with whom he had the honour to be associated. They were all men of ability, of high character, of great public spirit. They were all men of real zeal. And he was very glad to notice that nothing had been said that day in the least to impeach the character or attack the judgment or wisdom of any of those three distinguished men. As regarded the other members of the staff, various statements had been made with regard to their promotion and the qualifications which they possessed, upon which, of course, he could offer no opinion. He had not had opportunities of making acquaintance with more than a few members of the staff. The few he had seen appeared to him to be competent and tactful men. How far that applied to the other members of the staff he could not say. He believed that apart from the auditors and the inspectors, the other members of the staff were appointed by competitive examination, and therefore clearly no charge of partisanship or favouritism could be made in those cases. As regarded the auditors, they had to pass a qualifying examination conducted by the Civil Service Commission, which examination, he supposed, afforded a guarantee of their special competence. Now he would come to the particular points which had been made. The hon. Member for Limerick had drawn what appeared to him to be a picture of the Board more creditable to his imagination than to his facts. The picture was a good deal removed from the Board as he (Mr. Bryce) had occasion to know it. He did not believe the Board was at all anxious to worry people in the way which the hon. Member believed it did. The hon. Member thought, for instance, that the Chief Secretary was so much entangled in a sort of web of officialdom, and so much afraid of the thunders of the Orangemen, that it would be perfectly impossible for him to shake himself free of those trammels and do justice. He confessed he was not sensible of living in that state of panic, and if the hon. Member would bring any case of injustice to his notice he would endeavour to deal with it. He would steel his courage even against the Orangemen, and try to render that web of no effect. So far he had not had a great many cases to deal with. When he had dealt with them he had generally found that the Local Government Board had proceeded upon good sound reasons. In some cases he had found it possible to vary the proposals of the Board and to allow a little more latitude to the local authority than the Board had thought they were able to do. That, of course, was a privilege which belonged to a responsible Minister, who was sometimes able to go a little further in that way than the permanent officials could do, especially as he was responsible to this House, and if his action were impeached in this House he was there to defend it. Therefore, he thought it was quite right that he should sometimes, perhaps, reverse or vary the decisions of the Board. But that did not imply that he had not the utmost confidence in the good sense and tact which the Board brought to bear upon the discharge of its duties. Tho hon. Member for Limerick had spoken about the minutes of local bodies. That happened long before he came into office. But he believed the facts were that the Local Government Board soon after the Act of 1898 communicated with the local authorities, telling them that they believed it would be to their advantage, in order that they might be able to keep to the letter of the law, if they were to send up their minutes to the Board. The local authorities, he believed, accepted that proposal and did send up their minutes for some considerable time.

MR. JOYCE said Limerick did not.

MR. BRYCE said he did not speak of all the local authorities. Limerick, no doubt, as an ancient city thought it had a character to maintain. At any rate, it was apparently generally done, and he was quite sure that it was done on the whole with good results. But after a time, it would appear they came rather too late, and the Local Government Board could not apply sufficient time, and by degrees the practice dropped off. But when the local authorities ceased to send their minutes the Local Government Board did not press them further on the subject. If they sent up their minutes now the Local Government Board was glad to see them, but if they did not send them up, if there was any loss it was that of the local authority. There was no need to apply pressure or any arbitrary rule at all. Then the hon. Member dwelt on the question of surcharges. It would take too long to go through the cases mentioned in detail, but in the great majority of cases the Local Government Board remitted the surcharge, not necessarily blaming the auditor, because the primary duty of the auditor was to call attention to any points in regard to which he thought the council ought to be within the letter of the law; but when these matters were brought before the Board, the Board in the exercise of its discretion considered each case, and in the majority of cases remitted the surcharges. In regard to the borough councils, if he recollected aright, there were sixteen cases, of which twelve were remitted. One of the four cases which were not remitted was that of holidays, and the Local Government Board thought that was a case of sufficient difficulty to make it worth while to let the opinion of the Courts be taken. It was a difficult matter to know how far they ought to allow employees to be paid for the time of holidays. A public body was a little tempted from kindness of heart to act on the side of indulgence. Personally he was in favour of holidays, and he should like if they could take more themselves. At the same time it was only fair that the interests of the ratepayers should be considered. Employees got far more holidays in Ireland than in England, because there was a very large number of Church holidays in Ireland which were always allowed and paid for. Therefore no question arose as regarded that matter. The Bank holidays were also allowed and, he thought, quite properly allowed. But when it came to people leaving their work to attend race-meetings and regattas, a different set of considerations appeared to arise. Race-meetings were very popular in some parts of Ireland, and if employees were to go to all the race meetings in Ireland, no doubt there would be a good deal of abstention from work. Under the circumstances, it was thought fair that the case should be determined by the Court, and the Court, he understood, gave its decision in favour of the Bank holidays, but that there ought not to be an allowance of pay—in other words that the surcharge was correct—in regard to holidays to attend race-meetings and regattas. He himself would like to see this question settled by some sort of general arrangement which would meet both the wishes of the council and the obligations of the law, which the Local Government Board had to enforce. He did not see why—especially in an old city like Limerick, built upon a river and taking an interest in aquatic pursuits—a regatta holiday might not occasionally be given. At the same time it was perfectly clear that that liberty could not go to an unlimited extent. He suggested, therefore, that the council should draw up a scheme suggesting a certain number of holidays, that this might be discussed with the Local Government Board, and that if the Board could see its way within the terms of its statutes to allow such a holiday, that might be done. He did not think there would be any disposition on the part of the Board to approach the subject in any but a liberal and indulgent frame of mind, and on the other hand the Mayor of Limerick had said that he, as a reasonable man was anxious to deal with this question in a reasonable spirit. Apropos of surcharges, they were not confined to Ireland. One might have thought from the language used that this was a special form of torture and oppression invented by the Local Government Board to inflict peculiar suffering on Irish local bodies. But the system of surcharges existed in England just as much. For the year ending March 31st, 1905, the number of summonses as to which there were surcharges in England amounted to 3,456. He hoped Irish Members would remember that fact.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The English Local Government Board is responsible to English opinion. It is quite different in Ireland.

MR. BRYCE said the Irish Local Government Board was being made responsible to the House of Commons that day. There were two ways of dealing with the question of surcharging. One was to bring it before the Courts, and the other to raise it in the House of Commons. Of course, it could be brought before him personally. On the whole the system did not work badly. The hon. Member for North Longford had referred to a great many cases which happened long before his (Mr. Bryce's) time, and he was not able to deal with them. There was one point, however, upon which he might throw a little light. Complaint had been made that many expenses were thrown upon the local authority after the Act of 1898 which were not thrown on them before. He agreed that the cost of local administration had become greater since 1898. It had been suggested that that was because the landlords no longer paid and that the payment fell upon the ratepayers. But there was one fact which ought to be mentioned. A new system had been introduced, and consequently many reforms which were hanging fire had received an impetus which carried them on. He believed that happened in 1898. The case of nursing was an instance in point, in connection with which he was sure the ratepayers did not grudge the great expense, seeing that it gave them more efficient nursing for the sick poor. Reference had also been made to the elaborate returns prescribed by the Local Government Board. The complexity of the orders was largely due to the statute which imposed these duties on the different authorities. It was not the fault or the perversity of the Board; it was because Parliament rerequired elaborate accounts. At the same time he sympathised with the complaints, and so far as he had any interest in the matter it should be directed to the simplification of the returns. He believed the Vice-President of the Local Government Board would be glad to receive any suggestions from the county councils. The hon. Member for North Longford had dwelt upon a matter of an entirely different character, namely, the application of an order under which a person who had received a sentence of hard labour might be disqualified from holding public office. He would look into that matter, but as far as his information went at present he believed that that disqualification was one effected by statute. In that case it could only be altered by legislation. As the hon. Member had called his attention to the matter, he would see how the legal aspect of the question stood. In regard to the asylums grant, that was a question, as the hon. Member was aware, for the Treasury rather than the Irish Government. There was already an allowance, but unfortunately the expense of maintaining asylums was increasing owing to the increase in lunacy. He greatly hoped that they would find means by better sanitary arrangements and by reducing intemperance to arrest the growth of lunacy; but in the meantime it was no doubt true that the ratepayers were being put to a heavy additional charge under this head. He was perfectly willing to represent the matter to the Treasury if hon. Members would furnish him with particulars of the case, but he could not say what view the Treasury would take. They might think that it ought to be considered a local charge. As to Richmond Asylum, to which hon. Members had called attention, he said that the version of the case which they had presented was totally different from that which he had heard. He was not competent to tell the whole story from the beginning even if the Committee thought it desirable that he should do so. The Board did not want to go into a law suit and they refused to take any action. But the local body raised a legal question and then the Board said: "If you question our view of the law we must go into Court." He himself intervened with the view of effecting a compromise, and a compromise was effected on every point but one. That was a question of principle. It was a question whether the chief responsible officer of the asylum should be the clerk or the resident medical superintendent. The Board took the view of their inspectors that he should be the resident medical superintendent, who was more fitted for the general direction of an institution for the care and cure of the insane than a clerk without professional knowledge. The Richmond Asylum took the view that it should be the clerk. There were three things of great importance in connection with this matter. One was the opinion of the medical profession, and in particular of those members of the medical profession who had devoted special attention to the question of lunacy. They were of opinion that it ought to be the medical superintendent. The second point was the opinion of the inspectors of asylums. They were perfectly clear that the responsibility should be retained in the medical superintendent. They said that he was much fitter to have the general direction of the institution. Thirdly, there were the committees of lunatic asylums generally in Ireland. He understood that an immense majority of these committees were against the view taken by the Richmond Asylum Committee on this subject. The Richmond Asylum Committee and, he believed, the Limerick Asylum Committee also, were the only committees in Ireland which to the best of his knowledge and information desired to put the clerk in supreme command as against the medical superintendent.

*MR. COGAN (Belfast) also joined, not to put the clerk in supreme command, but to make him responsible in his own department.

MR. BRYCE said that all the other asylums were in favour of the view taken by the Board. Under the circumstances he thought the Board had done right.

*MR. COGAN asked why the Local Government Board receded from the position they took up in November, 1905, when they chose to agree to the terms asked for by the Asylum committee. Could the right hon. Gentleman explain that, except as the result of some medical intrigue?

MR. BRYCE said he must repudiate altogether that suggestion. What the Board said in 1905 did not come under his personal knowledge, because he was not in office then. Reference had been made to the alleged *lâches* on the part of the Local Government Board about the furnishing of plans for cottages. It was hoped that the new Labourers Act would quicken the process of building cottages all over Ireland, and the Local Government Board would gladly furnish plans and give advice and assistance in regard to the erection of cottages. He was sorry to hear that the question of vagrancy had assumed such proportions in Ireland. They were not losing sight of that question. The Commission which was sitting to investigate the Poor Law in England and Ireland intended to devote its attention to this subject, and he believed it intended to look into the subject with special reference to Ireland. The Poor Law Commission for Ireland whose report was nearly ready, had, he believed, considered this question, and was reporting upon it. He thought a system of boarding-out for pauper children was far better than herding them together in a workhouse. He thought he had now disposed of nearly all the points which hon. Members had submitted to him.

Mr. JOYCE asked why it was that if a local body went into court with the Local Government Board and won the case, the costs should not be paid by the Board.

Mr. BRYCE: That is not known to me.

Mr. JOYCE: I think I have proved it to-night.

Mr. BRYCE said the hon. Member had made a great many general statements which did not establish that there was a general practice when these cases came before the courts. The hon. Member had mentioned a particular case in which the court decided that each party should pay its own costs, but that did not prove that in every case the Local Government Board got off scot free. The hon. Member had advanced a general proposition for which he had not give any proof at all.

Mr. JOYCE said the hon. Member for South Tipperary mentioned a case in regard to which they had to fight in this House for two years to get the costs.

Mr. BRYCE said that if the hon. Member for Limerick would satisfy him as to the facts careful inquiry would be made. Of the work generally of the Local Government Board his experience had been short, and it was not for him to pronounce in very positive terms; but the Board was desirous of remedying any complaints. Undoubtedly the administration of such a department should be in accord with the sentiments of the people, and if it was true—though on this point he believed there was much exaggeration—that it was out of sympathy with public feeling, it was much to be deplored. The efforts of all concerned should be to bring legislation and administration into accord with the real interests of the people. Popular opinion changed, and was not always in the right; but, speaking generally, the test of good government was the support and confidence of the people. He quite agreed with hon. Members that legislation and administration should accord with popular sentiment, and it was the desire of the Board that the staff should be animated by that feeling. In any local inquiry officials of the Board should go among the people as friends and treat them with confidence, with an absence of the spirit of red tape or bureaucratic superiority. That was a test of good government, and so far as the Board would influence its officials, that was the spirit in which their administration would be conducted. There should be no spirit of red tape or bureaucracy. In any proposals His Majesty's Government might make for changes in the administrative system of Ireland or anything relating to Ireland, they would have this desire for co-operation and confidence between those who administered affairs and the people on whose behalf they administered.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that when he was at the head of the Local Government Board for England he heard precisely the same criticisms passed on departmental administration as he had heard in Ireland. The principles and practice in administration were precisely the same, and so far as the *personnel* in the Irish Office was concerned he could say with regard to some of the questions mentioned in the discussion, notably nursing and workhouse affairs, they had the most earnest attention. Into official administration no question of religion or of party politics ever entered. Whether they succeeded or failed, certainly failure was not due to any lack of energy, devotion, or single-minded application to work on the part of those connected with the Board. As to the asylums grant, the same difficulty existed in England in relation to the standard year, and alteration would mean the reopening of the whole question of relief in aid of local taxation. He need say nothing upon the remark in which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to adumbrate some future proposals; it would be time to consider them when they knew what they were. Certainly they would not be justified by any failure in duty by the Local Government Board in Ireland.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.) said that there had been a considerable number of rosy comments on the Irish administration. These were all very well, but still they could not forget that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had not by any means been so energetic in carrying his promises into effect as Irish Members desired, and as the circumstances required. They would be very glad if the right hon. Gentleman would only begin to carry out his promises. The Chief Secretary had omitted altogether from his otherwise acceptable statement any reference to the extravagant cost of the Irish Local Government Board. It might be considered that to put down a Motion to reduce the Vote by a large sum was no more than an idle formality; but he begged to assure the Committee that the Irish Members had solemn reasons for putting this Motion on the Paper, and that they were going to a division upon it. They knew that of all the Departments of State in the British Islands the most expensive by a long way was the Local Government Board in Ireland. He insisted that the expense of that department was utterly unreasonable. The Scotish people paid for their Local Government Board £15,000 a year, but in Ireland they had to pay for a similar department £75,000 a year, or almost five times as much as Scotland paid, while the administration in Ireland was twenty times worse. Most of the salaries and expenses were paid to men who had friends in power, and whose chief duty it was to create billets for each other. In fact, the Irish Local Government Board, as at present constituted, was an irritating anachromism. In addition to its own cost the Board caused needless expenditure by local bodies throughout the country. It had increased the cost of indoor paupers in Ireland by £100,000 since 1897. The landlords, knowing that they would not be elected, opposed the Bill of 1898 and urged as a reason that the new boards would be extravagant. Immediately however the new boards came into existence under the Act of 1898 they used their influence, with the result that they advocated and brought about increased expenditure which was sanctioned by the Local Government Board. It was rather suspicious that this increase of expenditure for the sake of humanity synchronised with the escape of the landlords from liability in regard to their share of the rates. The Board did not become humanitarian in regard to expenditure until liability was taken off the landlords and firmly fixed upon the tenants. In some cases the Board insisted upon local authorities retaining officers whose services were not required, and in others they refused to allow them to employ officials whose services were required. One of the first things which the Chief Secretary ought to do and which was within his legal competence was to bring down the extravagant cost of this Board in regard to inspectors and hangers-on, whose salaries amounted to £75,000 a year. In the next place the right hon. Gentleman should introduce some system of election, and have the vice-presidents and secretary of the Local Government Board elected by a national body such as the General Council of the Irish County Council. The third point was that the Board should be restrained from making arbitrary, irritating, and expensive orders with regard to local circumstances, and that a cessation of this conduct should be insisted upon. He was glad to see that the right hon Gentleman was encouraging the boarding-out of pauper children, but he should also insist upon the proper examination of medical and surgical officers employed by the Local Government Board to attend upon the poor.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool Exchange) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided; Ayes, 140; Noes, 62. (Division List, No. 276.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, SirJohnT.(Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Caldwell, James
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd.
Cory, Clifford John
Cox, Harold
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hn. George H.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gooch, George Peabody
Gulland, John W
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Higham, John Sharp
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launcest'n
Marnham, F. J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Radford, G. H
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Cl.Edw.J.
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon.T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sutherland, J. E.
Thomasson, Frankln
Thompson,J W.H.(Somerset,E.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H De. R. (Leicester)
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax.)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Bolton,T.D.(Derbyshire,N.E)
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fullerton, Hugh
Ginnel, L.
Halpin, J.

Mr. Ginnell.

Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Murnagham, George
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Connor,James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Weir, James Galloway
White, Patrick (Meath, North)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Boland.

Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,556 be granted for the said Service," put accordingly, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,118, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums."

*MR. LONSDALE,(Armagh, Mid.) said the Government had told the House that their policy in Ireland was to govern in accordance with Irish ideas, until such times as they were able to pass a measure of Home Rule into law. Seven months of this preparation for the Nationalist millennium had passed, and he ventured to think there were very few who would declare that the results were encouraging. In the first place the Chief Secretary and his colleagues had given a too restricted interpretation to the term "Irish ideas." In the view of the Government there was but one Ireland—which was peopled wholly by Nationalists, and when they declared their policy to be one of administering the affairs of Ireland in accordance with Irish ideas they meant that the Nationalists were the only persons to be considered. That was clearly shown by the history of the past seven months. Since this Government had been in office they had studiously disregarded not only the ideas, but the rights of Irish Unionists, who comprised at least one-fourth of the population, and who represented in much greater proportion the energy and capacity which had made the north-east of Ireland such a remarkable contrast to the rest of the country. The administration of Irish affairs under this Government was, in fact, Government by the grace of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. The Chief Secretary—like the sunflower—had his face turned always towards the luminary of the Nationalist Party. Every act of the Government seemed to be governed by the single idea of conciliating the Nationalists; and those who represented the Unionists of Ireland had just cause of complaint that the administration, which should be impartial and just to all, had been characterised by a spirit of hostility towards the loyalist minority. He desired on this occasion to draw attention to one or two examples of the animus which had been shown towards the people and the interests he and his friends represented in this House. There was the case of the Assistant Land Commissioners. Could anyone honestly say that the five Commissioners who were displaced were got rid of for any other reason than that they were Unionists, and their places were wanted to satisfy the clamourings for office of Nationalist agitators? It was undoubtedly a step in the direction of destroying the independence of the Land Commission, and bringing it into subservience to the United Irish League. A still more striking illustration of the animus of the Government was to be found in the Local Registration of Title Bill. The real purpose of that measure could not be disguised. It was brought in with the object of penalising a Unionist solicitor, because he was objectionable to the Nationalists;

and of rewarding a Nationalist solicitor who was formerly election agent for the hon. Member for Cork City. The Labourers Bill afforded yet another example of the policy of pinpricks which this Government was pursuing towards the Unionists of Ireland. This was a peculiarly hard case; because the Government had carried their persecution of Unionists to the extreme length of proposing to inflict injury upon the poor labourers of Ulster. Some of the northern counties of Ireland were to be robbed of money which had been allocated to them by statute in order to satisfy the greed of counties where the Nationalists predominated, and consequently Unionist labourers would be prevented from obtaining the cottages they need, while increased facilities were to be given to Nationalists. The same sort of thing was going on in every direction. The policy of the Government was marked by bitter hostility to every Unionist and Loyalist interest, whilst concession was made to the forces of disorder and disunion. Since this Government came into office the power of the law had been deliberately weakened, while, on the other hand, the illegal courts of the United Irish League had been allowed to exact fines from and impose penalties upon the unhappy victims of league tyranny who received no adequate protection from the Government. The right hon. Gentleman found it necessary to apologise to the Nationalist Party if he had to use the forces of the Crown to uphold individual rights, and he endeavoured to procure surrenders to authority by means of wholesale concessions to Nationalist demands. The pliability of the right hon. Gentleman had become notorious. He had been described by one of the Labour allies of the Nationalist Party as "a scholastic sponge—readily absorbent and readily squeezable." It must be confessed, he should think, even by the warmest admirers of the right hon. Gentleman, that he had shown himself, to a remarkable degree, amenable to Nationalist pressure. The new Gaelic movement, which, however worthy might be the motives of many who supported it, had degenerated into a mere political organisation, inspired by hatred of England and all things English, found a warm sympathiser in the Chief Secretary. He had done what he could to foster the teaching of Irish in elementary schools. Money was thereby wasted in useless teaching, the children were prevented from acquiring more useful knowledge, and—what was even worse—ideas of disloyalty were spread among the rising generation. The Chief Secretary, some time ago, took exception to his remark that the Irish language was made a convenient vehicle for the dissemination of seditious views, and he would, therefore, commend to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman a statement of the object of the Gaelic League which appeared in a letter written to the *Freeman's Journal* by Mr. John Sweetman, a prominent member of the brotherhood. He wrote as follows —

> "The one movement that is leading to the creation of a real Irish nation is the revival of the Irish language. Englishmen who are living in Ireland, and those who wish to be West Britons, are quite right in thinking that the revival of the Irish language is most dangerous to the Union of England and Ireland."

One feature of this Gaelic movement—to which he had called attention on more than one occasion—had been the circulation of foul libels against the forces of the Crown, with the object of deterring Irishmen from enlisting in the Army and Navy. The attitude of the Government towards that movement had been one of complete indifference. Indeed, some encouragement to it had been given by the release of a notorious distributor of these libels, some months in advance of the termination of the sentence awarded him by the Court of law, and it was not surprising that this individual had received the Nationalist martyr's crown of election to a public office. Every single act of the Government seemed to be vitiated by enmity towards Loyalist feelings and interests. It was nothing less than an outrage on propriety —to say nothing of justice—to place on the Dublin University Commission a violent partisan and disappointed office-seeker, who had constantly vilified Trinity College, and who was the arch-apostle of the doctrine of de-anglicisation. He referred to Dr. Douglas Hyde. The Government were gaining nothing beyond a temporary quietness by the course which they were pursuing. It was only natural that their policy should awaken the strongest feelings of resentment among the Unionists of Ireland, and the Chief Secretary was already being abused in Nationalist quarters because he had not gone far enough. Nationalist gratitude had an eye only to the future. The right hon. Gentleman must have found out already that even with his well-known sympathy for Nationalist aims he could not keep pace with the demands of hon. Members below the gangway. If the Chief Secretary read the Irish newspapers—[Mr. Bryce: I never do; I have not time.]—he must have been pained many times recently by the language which was being used towards him and his Government by the scribes of the Nationalist Party. The right hon. Gentleman had cast abroad the pearls of his sympathy with a lavish but discriminating hand, with the result that might have been expected. His name and reputation were already the sport of discontented Nationalist agitators whom he had tried in vain to conciliate. It might perhaps be too much to hope that the right hon. Gentleman would admit that the Government policy of making concessions to clamour and casting sops to sedition was a mistake. But they had a right to demand that the Government would cease their attempts to score off Irish Unionists in order to win the applause of Nationalists, and that so long as they were responsible for the affairs of Ireland they would give them a thoroughly impartial administration in which every law-abiding Irishman might have confidence. He begged to move.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said he was to second the proposal. He had been in the House a long time. He entered it a young man. He was now old. Since he had been a Member he had heard a vast number of speeches made as to how Ireland should be governed. Now he was going to take the other line. He was going to speak on how, he thought, Ireland ought not to be governed. Ireland was a very easy country to govern if they went the right way about it. There were only two possible ways of governing Ireland. One was to govern Ireland as they governed Scotland, England, and Wales. That was the way he would govern Ireland. If that method was pursued he ventured to maintain that Ireland would be an easy country to govern. The other way was the way which, as far as he could see, His Majesty's Government intended to pursue; that was to allow the reins of Government to fall from their hands into those of the organisation which was the only organisation willing to take up the task. Whether the organisation which took up the task would bring about a peaceful, contented, and happy Ireland, he left it to the future to decide. What was going to be the future of Ireland under His Majesty's Government? In Ireland—and he thought hon. Gentlemen below the gangway would agree with him in this—they did not care about the old names to describe political Parties. The words "Tory," "Conservative," "Liberal," and "Radical" meant very little to an Irishman. What did matter to an Irishman was how Ireland was going to be governed. When the last change of Government took place the question uppermost in the minds of Irishmen was not the name of the Government but how they were going to anage Ireland. It was not very long before they had an indication of the lines upon which the Government of Ireland was to be run. It occurred at a place called Loughrea. There was one difficulty undoubtedly in the way of the Member for Waterford and his friends, and that was the prosperity of Ireland. If Ireland at the present moment was in a state of commercial collapse or if it were suffering from depreciated prices, then, of course, hon. Members might say, "Try some other way and see whether you will succeed." But he ventured to say, and he defied contradiction founded on fact, that Ireland within living memory had never been so prosperous as she was to-day. No one rejoiced in that more than he did himself. But as to carrying on an agitation in Ireland without a grievance, it was an absolute impossibility. He had to accuse the Nationalist Party of gross ingratitude to a man who had been of great assistance to them for twenty years. He referred to Lord Clanricarde. Whenever the Nationalist Party had been in want of a grievance Lord Clanricarde had come to their assistance. He had been the shillelagh, the battering ram, the great gun that the Nationalist party had fired off steadily for twenty years at the Irish landlords. But Lord Clanricade sometimes would not go off. An eviction took place at Loughrea. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford made an eloquent speech describing Lord Clanricarde. There was, however, not a shadow of foundation for the statement which he made on that occasion. He did not accuse the hon. and learned Gentleman of uttering what was untrue, but somebody had been stuffing him. He had always remarked that lies had something in common with swallows. Swallows had a homing instinct that brought them back from the uttermost parts of the earth to the place where they were bred. Somehow lies had a similar peculiarity. The greatest, most barefaced, and most successful lie of modern times was the yellow Chinese lie which had come back from South Africa, and was roosting on the Treasury Bench. He did not like to use the word "lie," or to apply it to the language of any Member below the gangway. He preferred to say "terminological inexactitude." A terminological inexactitude was hovering below the gangway. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford described a remarkable condition of affairs in the neighbourhood of Loughrea. He said that at this moment Lord Clanricarde's estate was a desert and that the Member for Galway (who must have been stuffing him) had the awful experience of living in that desert. Would the Committee believe it? There was not a particle of truth in that statement.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): Yes, there is; every word of it is true.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said the hon. Member for Galway could say what he liked when he had finished. The Chief Secretary, who followed the hon. Member for Waterford, made a most sympathetic answer without having gone into the case. The right hon. Gentleman was a man of philosophic mind and he would not have made the statement he did if he had gone into the facts. He simply swallowed every word of the eloquent speech of the hon. Member for Waterford, and said he hoped that the mischief that a case of this kind caused would not spread beyond the immediate neighbourhood of that one case. That showed the deep and heartfelt sympathy of the Chief Secretary in regard to a certain kind of eviction. An eviction carried out by Lord Clanricarde, according to the right hon. Gentleman, was a monstrous offence against civilisation. How about his sympathy for evictions carried out by the United Irish League. He did not hear one word from the Chief Secretary about their evictions round Loughrea. The sympathies of the Government were centred on one kind of eviction. What was the history of the war at Loughrea? It was asserted that the man Ward was served with notice and evicted because he was a secretary of the United Irish League. There was not a word of truth in that assertion.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: That is not my statement at all, but that of Lord Clanricarde's agent.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman was mistaken. He had a letter in his hand in which Ward himself stated that during these years of prosperity he identified himself in a very prominent manner with the United Irish League. He did not blame him for doing it; no one could blame him. But when Ward began to issue notices to quit to farmers in the neighbourhood of Loughrea, Mr. Tener stepped in and served him with a notice to quit. He would have done the same, and although he would never sympathise with Lord Clanricarde, nor with any man who took money out of Ireland and never went there, there were circumstances in regard to Lord Clanricarde which it would be well for the Committee to note. Lord Clanricarde's estate in Galway was the lowest rented estate in the whole country. Several of his tenants had gone into court to get a fair rent fixed and they had been nearly all raised. Here was the letter which Ward wrote to R. D. Levinge—

"At a meeting of the United Irish League held on the 21st inst. a resolution was adopted calling on all the graziers in the parish to surrender their farms on May 1st next, in order to facilitate the division of the land amongst small landowners, and those having no land in the parish, in anticipation of a sale. I am directed to write to you and request you to surrender Tully Hill Farm. I hope you will see your way to comply with this request, and fall into line with the other graziers in the district who have promised to surrender."

What right had any man to serve such a notice? If Lord Clanricarde had served it the whole Government as well as hon. Gentlemen below the gangway would have been up in arms. He was happy to say the person so addressed had not surrendered, but he had been strictly boycotted ever since. Reference had been made in former debates to the following letter:—

"Estate Office, Loughrea,
"*April 29th*, 1905.

"Dear Sir,—I have been glad to see from time to time signs of your doing a good trade, and I have often mentioned you as a capable and energetic man of business. It would be well, I think, for the country if it had more traders like you with push and determination to succeed, and as a tenant you have given me satisfaction. Holding these good opinions of you, it is with regret that I feel it my duty to send you a notice, the effect of which would oblige you to remove from the premises you hold. I have been an agent for many years, and have always, as far as possble to me, tried to protect tenants ill-treated by their fellow-tenants. I do not believe you personally desire to cause pain, annoyance, or injury to anyone. But as Secretary to the Loughrea Branch of the United Irish League you have done so, and I feel bound to use an *argumentum ad hominem* in the shape of the notice now served upon you.—Faithfully yours,

E. SHAW-TENER.

Although he did not defend Lord Clanricarde—he was not his style—he thought Lord Clanricarde was perfectly right. Most of his own tenants were members of the National Irish League; his head man was, he thought, a leader amongst the Nationalists; he did not mind that, but if a tenant farmer of his used the power at his disposal to threaten other tenants to cause them against their will to surrender their land he would turn that farmer out next day if he could. The turning out of Ward was an act of simple justice. What he was trying to do now was to attract public attention to the way things were done in Ireland. Very few Englishmen knew much about Ireland. Englishmen in the House heard one thing from Gentlemen below the gangway and another thing from Gentlemen above the gangway and they did not know whom to believe. No one should accept any statement about Ireland which could not be proved in black and white, and that was why he held in his hand a sheaf of quotations. Ward was served with notice to quit. He had two houses in the same street. The story he was now about to relate would show that the military spirit was inherent in the Irish race. In one of the houses Ward kept his stores, and this he carefully fortified—it was a sort of outwork. It was not meant to be seriously defended, but the other place he was determined to hold at all costs. Fortunately for him he was possessed of a method of fortification previously unknown in Loughrea—he had an immense number of manure bags, and these bags were used in much the same way as soldiers used sandbags for fortifications. The police effected an entry to the outwork and then the siege began. Three hundred policemen came down from Dublin to besiege this fort, but how to deal with these bags had never entered into the scope of their education. The police made no progress, and the Government evidently felt that at all hazards Ward should surrender. Then circumstances occurred which he thought were without parallel in any civilised country. Ward and his heroes were inside; outside were the police and the British law. Ward and his friends remained in triumph. It could not last, something had to be done or there would have been disaster. First of all, the Under Secretary for Ireland was summoned from Dublin to make a sort of general, and the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary were both called into play. Let the Committee conceive this happening in London somewhere down in Ratcliff Highway. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Or Park Lane.] Let the Committee conceive of a man who disliked paying his debts defying the law in London, and then let them conceive of the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Under Secretary writing letters entreating him to allow himself to be evicted. The Prime Minister's letter said—

"I am directed by the Prime Minister to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant, and to inform you that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is in communication with the Chief Secretary in respect to your case."

He did not wonder that hon. Members cheered. It was a great triumph for them. The Chief Secretary's letter was—

> "House of Commons,
> "*May 29th*, 1906.
>
> "Dear Sir,—I am desired by Mr. Bryce to acknowledge your letter which he received too late to enable a reply to be sent which would have reached you this morning. The Irish Government, as you are aware, has no power whatever to interfere with the exercise of landlords' rights, but is indeed actually bound by law as the Courts have frequently decided to give such assistance as enables the process of the law to be carried out. Mr. Bryce will however as you request consider the facts bearing on the case which you can bring before him in addition to those already indicated. The circumstances of hardship which your letter mentions seem to Mr. Bryce to add much strength to that demand to which he recently gave his support in Parliament for an alteration of the law."

Then Sir Antony MacDonnell also came on the scene—he was not going to forget him.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): He is an old friend of yours.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said this was what Sir Antony stated—

> "If any further action were taken in the way of resistance as contemplated by those in possession it might have the effect of tying the hands of the Government in such a way as to prevent them coming to the assistance of the town tenants as they desire."

This meant that if the resistance went too far it might interfere with the alteration of the law which would prevent such a thing taking place again. He did not know what the Committee thought of that. He did not know what the ordinary law-abiding Englishman thought of Ministers of the Crown communicating with a man who was fighting the law. What was the result? The hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Dublin stated, in a speech he delivered just after the surrender of the garrison who defended Martin Ward's house, that they would not have surrendered but for the assurance given by the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary that legislation would follow their submission, and that resistance in which blood might be shed would endanger the prospects of the Town Tenants Bill. He could not conceive a more dangerous and evil lesson to teach the Irish people than that deliberate resistance to the law, if carried on by one section of the people, would succeed. If, however, an Ulster tenant—who happened to be an Orangeman—adopted this policy he would have no letters from Members of the Government. But here the Government had absolutely surrendered to the League, and created the impression amongst the police who had to administer the law that the Government were on the side of the League. What was the effect upon the unfortunate tenantry who had been given notice to quit by the League? They had to surrender. [AN HON. MEMBER on the Irish Benches: "Poor fellows.] Yes, poor fellows. There was the case of a man named McInerny, who had a farm and had spent money on it, but who had to give it up at the dictation of the League. He wrote to the League a letter in which he said—

> "I thought a farm that any tenant would buy like that did not come under the rules laid down by the League."

What right had the League to lay down rules? After quoting the letter which McInerny wrote when announcing his decision to give up the farm, he asked whether Englishmen or Scotsmen or even Welshmen could conceive such a thing happening in their country. A man owned a farm; suddenly a society said, "You must give it up," and the man, terrorised to a certain extent, was forced to surrender what was of great value to him. The man who could conceive such a thing happening outside of Ireland ought to go to a lunatic asylum. The Chief Secretary, although he had not been very long in Ireland, no doubt knew what would have happened to McInerny if he had refused to give up the farm. He was prepared to give other instances of surrenders brought about by the League. As was stated by a speaker at a meeting of the League, "The Spion Kop they had in Loughrea has given them a lesson." One man was allowed by the League to hold his farm until October. What right had any organisation to issue such a decree? It was a monstrous thing that in the twentieth century in what was supposed to be a civilised country there was a Government which permitted such a state of things to exist. All the forces of the Crown ought to be at the disposal of even an Irish peasant to prevent gross injustice being done to anyone. This unfortunate fight in Ireland was not being waged between Protestants and Nationalists; or between Unionists and Nationalists. It was a fight within the Nationalist camp, the members of which were not all of one mind. [An Irish NATIONALIST MEMBER: What about the Unionist camp?] He was extremely glad of it. The Nationalists were not of one mind. [An Irish NATIONALIST MEMBER: What about East Tyrone?]

MR. MACVEAGH: Neither are the Orangemen.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (continuing) blamed the Government for appointing the hon. Member for North Mayo a member of the Commission on the working of the congested estates, and said they might as well appoint a burglar a member of a commission to inquire into the action of the police on the ground that he knew more about the police than anybody else. If he were on that Commission and the hon. Member for North Mayo were appointed he should resign by return of post. A man holding the views of the hon. Member could not give a fair and unbiassed decision, and his appointment was an insult to all law-abiding men in Ireland. According to a speech by the hon. Member for North Mayo it appeared that the hon. Member's attitude was that it was not the Irish Government who were responsible for the maintenance of law and order in Ireland but the Irish National League. In conclusion he disclaimed having made any party attack, his desire being to let the Government see the dangerous course they were pursuing. He had never heard a more manly and workmanlike speech than that which the Chief Secretary had made, which showed that the right hon. Gentleman had his heart in his work, but the course he was taking would lead to confusion and the breaking of the law.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Lonsdale.*)

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL congratulated the right hon. and gallant Gentleman on his restored health, and said he had seldom spoken with more vigour. His main grievance with the Government seemed to be that they had restored peace at Loughrea. He was so passionately fond of a row that he was grievously disappointed because Sir Antony MacDonnell went down to Loughrea and brought about order instead of war. It was necessary, however, to put in a few side touches to the picture to show the actual facts which had brought about the Government's interference. The hon. and gallant Member had asked what right had any organisation to demand the surrender of farms. They had not an atom of right, but the Act of 1903 never would have been passed if it had not contemplated the surrender of the grass lands. ["No," and "Yes."] The League, in serving a notice, had acted illegally, but the fact that the Prime Minister had written a letter to a shopkeeper was accepted by hon. Members opposite as being something new. The times were different now from what they had been in the earlier years of this struggle, and if the writing of such a letter was described as a crime by hon. Members opposite, all he could say was that it was a proper and kindly act. He thought that the action of Sir Antony MacDonnell in going to Loughrea was the best day's work that any Irish Government had ever done. Certainly it was far better than to tumble the cabins of the people about their ears. His view was that the Clanricarde estate was in such a condition that it was a danger to the whole of Ireland. No one knew better than the late Prime Minister that this estate was the real danger point in the struggle of twenty years ago. Nobody knew that better than the late Prime Minister, but he had been unable to do anything. Any man knowing those things could say nothing else than that the Government took a wise and statesmanlike and a prudent course when they went down and told Mr. Martin Ward—"You are not serving the cause that you desire to serve. The Town Tenants Bill is before the House of Commons now and has been read a second time. It is much better for you to leave your case in the hands of Parliament and in the hands of the Government than to take it into your own hands and defy the law." That was what the Government did by the Under-Secretary and they did the best day's work for Ireland that he had ever known a Government do. There was just one other point he desired to touch upon. The hon. Member for Mid-Armagh had attacked Dr. Douglas Hyde—whom he did not know personally, but whom he knew by reputation. The hon. Member had charged him with being the chief agent in a policy of de-Anglicising Ireland. Would hon. Gentlemen above the gangway take a moment's thought? Why should they try to turn Ireland into a province of England? Take Scotland. Did they think they could do that in Scotland? They tried it. But they failed, and they did not try it now because they would fail again. Why should they not allow Irish ideas—they might not be theirs—they might think some of them foolish, and they might be foolish—but why should not they let Ireland go her own way in those matters? Why should they attempt to make it a province of England? They were doing harm not only to Ireland but to England. They were doing more to imperil the union between the two countries by actions like these than ordinary Separatists in Ireland—and there were not many—were able to do. He had no reason to believe that anything he said would have any influence with hon. Members opposite, but he had been in this war longer than they—he had been in it for more than twenty years in this House—he had seen it at its worst, and he thought he saw gleams of a better day—and what he desired to say as an Ulster Member to hon. Gentlemen opposite was that they would do far more for a real and true union with England by not attempting to force their ideals upon the Irish people, but by recognising the hard fact that they were governing Ireland against its will, and that with household suffrage and constitutional Government they could not ultimately govern any people against their will. They would thus do far better for England, which they seemed to cherish more than they did Ireland—they would do far better for that province which they seemed sometimes to count to be Ireland alone—than by harrying everything Irish and setting themselves in antagonism to every Irish aspiration and every Irish ideal.

Mr. T. W. Russell.

*Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said that he entirely differed from the hon. Member for South Tyrone, when he suggested that because he had been longer in this House than many of those who represented Ulster constituencies he had a better right to voice the views of Ulster than others who represented it. They had an excellent reason for differing from the hon. Member on that point, because it was common knowledge that he was now declaring that the cause that he had advocated for so many years was wrong. He (Mr. Barrie) desired to associate himself with what had fallen from the leader of the Loyalist Party, who, with all his accustomed eloquence had re-stated the Ulster position and had stated that he could see no reason, and had never seen any, why Ireland should be governed differently from Scotland and England. He believed the only safe line on which a responsible Government could proceed was to deal as fairly and justly with Ireland as she was dealing with Scotland. He appreciated the importance of making his remarks as brief as possible, but he did desire to say a few words with reference to the Royal Commissions appointed by the present Government. He submitted that if the Report of a Commission was to carry weight, the composition of the Commission should be fair and equitable to all interests affected. He did not think that it could be honestly claimed for any of the Commissions appointed that care and discrimination had been exercised by the Government in their selection. They had heard a good deal of a notorious member of the Trinity College Commission. Still he was not prepared to come to the conclusion that when direct issues were put before the House there was not still a desire, in spite of the great change that had taken place, to be just and fair when a strong case was made out. He contended that the influence and weight of the Report when it was issued would be largely lost owing to the composition of the Trinity College Commission. The same result must also follow in the case of the Commission appointed to deal with the question of the congested areas. What would have been thought of a Government who proposed to appoint a Commission to deal with the congested districts in the extreme north of Scotland if they had insisted upon putting on that Commission a man with whom the law had had actively to deal during the previous twelve months? He passed from that and came to the Railway Commission recently appointed. In the composition of that Commission there were representatives of every part of Ireland except Unionist in Ulster. Now he had not yet lost all faith in the Chief Secretary. He knew the record of the right hon. Gentleman, and while he believed that the right hon. Gentleman had strayed from the right path in the last few months, he believed they would still be able to draw him back. When they came to the question of Irish railways and the conduct of them he thought Ulster ought to be represented on the Commission. There were probably more than one Unionist Member very largely associated in business with railways in Ulster, and who would be able to bring intelligent opinion to bear on the subject. It was not yet too late to restore confidence in the compostion of the Commission by placing an Ulster Member upon it. He ventured to say there was no more important question in Ireland at the present time than the question of the railways, and it was only fair that an Ulster Member should be upon the Commission. The last question he wished to bring before the Committee was the continueddelay in presenting the Report on the Poor Law. He was keenly interested in that subject. The Report should have been presented a good many months ago. He put a Question on the subject shortly after Parliament opened. He was promised they should have the Report at the end of April. On May 10th he asked another Question, and was told the Report was in the hands of the printers. Repeated Questions had been put down since, and to-day they were absolutely in the dark as to when the Commission would report. He suggested that there were reasons which had not been presented to the House, why the presentation of that Report was still further delayed. He understood that the Report had been before the Government and that its terms were not satisfactory.

MR. BRYCE: It has not been before me.

*MR. BARRIE was very glad to have that assurance, because he found that some portion of that Report was already public property. He submitted that the Report of a Commission should not be public property before it was considered by the Chief Secretary.

MR. BRYCE: Hear, hear.

*MR. BARRIE, continuing, entered his very earnest protest against any Amendment of that Report being suggested by the Chief Secretary or by the Commissioners in answer to one-sided representations made to them. In the county a portion of which he represented they had three workhouses with accommodation for 2,200 people. For many years past they had only had between 420 and 430 people in them. He was able a good many years ago to get a committee together from the three workhouses and a unanimous report was sent in advocating their amalgamation. Unfortunately politics ruled one part of the county and other politics another. Consequently there was no combination in deciding which workhouse should be closed. That difficulty was to be solved by the appointment of the Commission and the representatives of the extreme north should have opportunities of considering how that Report was going to affect them there and in other parts of Ireland.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) hoped the hon. Member for North Londonderry would not be angry with him if he compared him to Mirabeau, who was quite as laborious in his private life and whose public abilities would permit of favourable comparison. But when the hon. Gentleman spoke of the Railway Commission he was reminded of a conversation which took place between Mirabeau and Talleyrand. The former was speaking of the qualities required for a minister of Louis XVI, and he said he should be from the South of France, he should have a certain gift of eloquence (just like the hon. Member for North Derry), and many other qualities. When Mirabeau had quoted his last quality, Talleyrand turned round and said, "And he should also be pitted with the small-pox." Every student of history knew that Mirabeau was pitted with that complaint, and the reason the anecdote recalled itself was that the hon. Member for North Derry was giving a description of the qualifications of a member of the Railway Commission. The hon. Member claimed that one of its members should be a man of business, that he should be from Ulster, and that he should be acquainted with the state of affairs in Ulster—in other words, that he should be the Member for North Derry.

*MR. BARRIE: The Member I was referring to was the hon. Member on my left (the hon. Member for Mid Armagh).

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR regretted if he had raised any professional jealousy between the hon. Member for North Derry and the hon. Member for Mid Armagh. But what was Ulster? Did the hon. Gentleman represent all Ulster? He should say that on the evening of the day on which an Ulster constituency had returned a Nationalist Member to this House, Unionist Members might have shown a little modesty in speaking for that part of Ireland. There was a majority from Ulster in favour of a Liberal policy, and the minority which was opposing them was a dwindling one. It represented the dying embers of religious bigotry and of landlord oppression, and there was growing up even in Ulster a new spirit, a holier and more blessed spirit of union and re-conciliation between classes and creeds. The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had made his re-appearance on the scene. He was welcome. They all knew him to be a man of great political courage. But he confessed he was not prepared to find the right hon. and gallant Member's courage reach the sublime height of being an advocate and defender of the Marquess of Clanricarde. Here was a man who had drawn £30,000 or £40,000 a year for twenty years from the very poorest part of Ireland, from the very towns which were dwindling. He asked English Members what would be thought of an English landlord who had drawn this vast sum from his tenantry, and for twenty years had never set his foot on the land nor spent a shilling there. The people had asked for a little help for a railway in order to bring them within reach of the rest of the country, but his Lordship had never given a shilling towards it, or to any object, public or private, in the domain from which he drew his vast income. He did not want to paint him blacker than he deserved, but it was a well-known fact in Ireland that the Marquess never went to Ireland, even on the occasion of a domestic bereavement which would have appealed to any man. This was the hero of his right hon. and gallant friend the Member for North Armagh—a man who was scouted by the public opinion of England, hated by the public opinion of Ireland, and branded by as astute and strong a Conservative as the gentleman who up to a year ago they knew as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. His right hon. and gallant friend said they were at the parting of the ways. So they were. Ireland had been governed for several centuries against the will of her people. But said the hon. Gentleman, the Mirabeau of North Derry, who uttered sentiments of Irish loyalty with a Scottish accent, why was not Ireland governed exactly the same as England, Scotland and Wales? That was the question they were always asking. England returned a Liberal majority and had a Liberal Government. Scotland returned a Liberal majority and had a Liberal Government. Scottish Members were allowed to speak a foreign tongue, but Irish Nationalists were not allowed to address Mr. Speaker in Erse. He had been condemned to speak English by the tyranny of centuries. Unlike Scotland they were governing Ireland against the will of the people of Ireland, and so long as that state of things continued there would be discontent and dissatisfaction. He had listened with some apprehension to the simple phraseology of Mr. McNerny as quoted. What did he say? He said he was a good Irishman. He also said that he would give up his farm if he got a good price. There was nothing extraordinary about that. The great fault apparently was that the man belonged to a combination to put down or at least to discourage the seizing by land-grabbers of the land from which another tenant had been evicted for not paying an impossible rent. He had always wondered how men in this House had the courage to denounce a combination like that. Every barrister in this House was a member of a trade union which would persecute to poverty and disgrace and the workhouse, any man who dared to violate its rules. Every doctor in this House was a member of a trade union which would destroy the livelihood of any doctor who violated the rules of the union. Every working man in this House was a member of a trade union which dealt severely with anyone who violated the rules and laws which were necessary to equalise the great fight between capital on the one side and starvation on the other. What was the justification of trade unions in Ireland? Had his hon. friend ever read the pages of John Stuart Mill, and the ghastly stories he related about the great famine? Had he read how impossible rents had been demanded to such an extent that the whole of Ireland became rack-rented? In consequence of these conditions the Irish people made up their minds that they would form a combination under the law of trade unions in order that they might put an end to this hideous and insane competition for land at impossible rents. The results of that combination had been that on the Statute Book of Parliament to-day were to be found many laws which had broken the power of that dying landlordism whose weak and feeble voice they had heard that evening. Hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway did not understand Ireland, and perhaps they would forgive him for also saying that he did not believe that they understood England either. The Prime Minister had just sent to the peasantry of another land a great message of liberation and encouragement. The England which was represented in this House to-day was one to which he wished God-speed in every effort made for liberty in all lands, and none the less in the land to which he had the honour to belong.

MR. BRYCE said that, instead of having had a general criticism of the policy of the Irish Government, they had had a treatment of the little episode of Loughrea and a few groans about the composition of the Commissions recently appointed. He would advert shortly first to what was said about the Commissions by the hon. Member for North Derry. He did not know what his objection was to the Trinity College Commission. That Commission was issued four months ago, and he was not aware that either of the Members for Dublin University had taken any objection to it.

SIR. E. CARSON (Dublin University): I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I asked a question in this House why the right hon. Gentleman did not put on the Commission a single member of the Church of Ireland who lived in Ireland, and he told me that there were enough members on the Commission already.

MR. BRYCE said he had pointed out that there were Members on the Commission who were amply qualified to deal with the question of the theological faculty of Trinity College, and no question as to the general composition of the Commission had been raised by either of the Members for Dublin University. The hon. Member opposite complained of the composition of the Congested Districts Commission. There was one Member, he said, who held strong views about the tenants. That was true, but there was another, the former hon. Member for Yarmouth, who held strong views on the side of the landlords. [OPPOSITION Cries of "Oh!"] The hon. Member for North Mayo, who was also on the Commission, was chairman of the county council of Mayo, and had great knowledge and experience of the congested district problem; and he was admirably fitted to set forth the case of the tenants. The hon. Member had carried his complaint further and said there was no representative of Ulster on the Railways Commission. There was a very distinguished man from Ulster, the head of one of the greatest firms in Ireland, Lord Pirrie. No man stood higher in business circles in Ireland or had larger experience of Irish industrial affairs. He believed the difficulty of selecting persons from one Irish company who would be acceptable to another Irish company would be so great that the best plan to represent railway interests was to select eminent railway men from England whose eminence in in the railway world everybody would acknowledge. He thought a Commission consisting of Sir Charles Scotter, Sir Herbert Jekyll, Mr. Acworth, and Mr. Aspinall could hardly be objected to. Of what did the hon. Member complain?

MR. BARRIE: That there is no Unionist Member upon it.

MR. BRYCE said there was no Liberal Member and no Nationalist Member upon it. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Pirrie."] He did not know what the politics of Lord Pirrie were. At any rate, he had always belonged to the party to which hon. Members opposite belonged. He did not see why it was necessary in connection with a Commission upon railroads to ask whether a man was a Liberal or a Tory any more than to ask whether he was a Catholic or a Protestant. He passed from this irrelevant matter to the question brought forward by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh. He was glad to see the right hon. Gentleman back in his old form, and he hoped they might have him for many years in the House to delight them with his genial treatment of a thorny subject. The right hon. Gentleman in his speech had compared what he called the "Siege of Loughrea" to the Siege of Troy, and then he had entertained them to a comic account of that "Siege." He had described it as if it had been a shocking humiliation to the Government that the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary had answered two letters which they had received from a Loughrea shopkeeper. These letters from Loughrea had been answered before the siege began, when Mr. Ward was merely contemplating resistance, and when the forces had not yet gathered to sound their trumpets. When he heard the right hon. Gentleman read the letter of the Prime Minister, he thought it was a letter characterised with Caledonian caution, and although he listened with some trepidation when the right hon. Gentleman read his own letter—for he himself had forgotten the terms of it—he was relieved to find he had said nothing more than that he would be obliged to carry out the eviction, and that Mr. Ward would be doing a very bad turn to the town tenants by resistance. He submitted that that was very good advice. That advice was attributed to the Under-Secretary, but he himself had the honour and glory of giving that advice himself. He would tell the House what the Under-Secretary did. This was the important part of the story. The Under-Secretary found a very difficult position when he got to Loughrea—a very dangerous position. Loughrea was a peculiar place. It was for many years a scene of disorders, and in the bad years from 1879 to 1884 there was no place in Ireland where there was more constant danger of disturbance. The reason for that everybody knew. When the Under-Secretary got to Loughrea, people were coming in from all districts. It was not the fault of the police that the eviction was not carried out completely at once. It was the fault of the under-sheriffs and the bailiffs. There was a great force of police to carry out the eviction and everything the Government did to support the sheriff was in conformity with their legal duty, and any other sympathies behind that made no difference to the discharge of their duty. The people were streaming in from all quarters. They were in a state of irritation and resentment against the landlord, and nothing but a small spark was wanted to light a fire which might have spread over all parts of the country. It was a dangerous situation, and preparations were being made for resistance which might have led to much bloodshed. The Under-Secretary saw the people and talked with them. He told them what the dangers were and he recalled their minds to a sense of their duty. He was ably seconded by the parish priest, who threw the whole weight of his influence in favour of peace; the people and Mr. Ward himself yielded to this persuasion and agreed to give up the premises and allow the eviction to go on. He thought that was a triumph of persuasion on the part of the Under-Secretary, and a triumph of good sense on the part of the people. No bargain whatever was made by the Under-Secretary. He told the people simply what was in their interests and what ought to be done. What did that mean? The Under-Secretary secured peace. Was that a thing to complain of? He saw in some cutting from a newspaper sent to him that morning that the police were forbidden to use their bayonets. In point of fact no such question arose but the man who wrote that letter thought it would have been a good thing if the police had used their bayonets. Did that Committee think that the crowd in Loughrea should have been charged with bayonets? [Cries of "No, no," and a voice "Who wrote the letter?"] It was anonymous. Hon. Members opposite entirely repudiated the sentiments of that letter. He wished these letters were not written. Even as anonymous letters they might do harm. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Government surrendered to the League. It was Mr. Ward and his friends who surrendered to the law. The Government never surrendered to the League and would never surrender to any League anywhere. Loughrea was a very peculiar district. It had formed long habits of disorder. It was a point of danger, and it ought to nave been treated sooner in the way it had been treated now. But it was not the only case. There was the case of the Dunsandle estate a year or two ago in the neighbourhood of Loughrea, where there was a serious danger of a breach of the peace and where the irritation between the landlords and tenants had reached a dangerous point. That was in the days of one of his predecessors. The Under-Secretary went down on that occasion to the Dunsandle estate, he met the people and brought about a pacific arrangement between the landlord and the tenants, and succeeded in negotiating a sale, and that which was on the point of an outbreak had since then been perfectly peaceful. He wished a policy of that kind had been oftener followed before, and he thought the more such a policy was followed in Ireland the better. The result of that policy on the Dunsandle estate had been that the tenantry having become under the action of the Estates Commissioners the owners of their own tenancies had begun to show an industry and an energy which were already making the country wear a prosperous aspect. The tenants were already full of hope, and they were becoming an example and a sign of hope to the surrounding peasantry. He earnestly hoped that the same policy which had brought about tranquillity and prosperity on the Dunsandle estate and other estates in the neighbourhood would under the action of the Estates Commissioners be more and more extended throughout Connaught until those dangers which they now saw had entirely disappeared.

SIR E. CARSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us what is the condition of Loughrea at the present moment?

MR. BRYCE said it was a good deal quieter than it was a week or ten days ago, and it had been found possible to reduce the forces of the police stationed there. But its condition was still such as to require a force of police larger than that ordinarily required. Although the position was better he could not say that the danger had entirely disappeared.

MR. DUFFY: That was due absolutely to the emergency men.

MR. BRYCE said that would lead him into a discussion on a point that he did not want to pursue at present. The difficulties in Loughrea were not entirely due, as the right hon. Gentleman would have them suppose, to the action of the United Irish League or to the action of the friends of the tenant. They were also due to the irritating and provocative way in which the other side occasionally behaved.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: What other side?

MR. BRYCE said he would tell the right hon. Gentleman. The Government of the King was bound everywhere to give support to the law. It was bound to carry out an eviction, and it was bound to keep order. It was bound to prevent intimidation, and it did all these things. But it had no power to take corresponding action to prevent people who ought to know better from behaving in an irritating way and giving needless provocation to the people. He thought it was greatly to be regretted that those whose position and station and place of authority and influence ought to lead them to do their duty by the public and to abstain from provocation and to assist in maintaining tranquility and peace, so far forgot their duty as to offer wanton provocation and to make it far more difficult to maintain peace than it ought to be. It was perfectly well known to whom he was referring. [Cries of "Whom?"] He was referring to the landlord and those who represented the landlord. That was a matter which unfortunately they were unable to cope with in Ireland. There were countries in which a strong executive Government exercised control over those who created disturbances on the landlord's side as well as on the tenant's side. In Ireland the British Government had no such power, and all he could do therefore was to appeal to all parties—both sides—to abstain from every kind of provocation and to make the task of preserving the peace as easy as it could possibly be made. The right hon. Gentleman and the Committee would be glad to have a few figures with regard to the present state of Ireland compared with what it was last year. First of all he would give the cases of the outrages which had taken place all over Ireland and were reported to the police up to the 30th June of the present year compared with those reported up to 30th June last year. Last year the number of outrages over all Ireland was 895 for these six months. This year the number was 858. In Galway—and it was Galway they were particularly concerned with at that moment—up to the 30th June last year there were in East Galway forty-five outrages and other offences. This year there were thirty-five. In the West Riding of Galway there were up to the 30th June last year forty-nine outrages, and this year twenty. Considering that Galway was one of the most troubled districts at present that was a very satisfactory record.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Do these figures include threatening letters?

Mr. BRYCE said that they did; they included exactly what had always been included under the head of agrarian outrages. There was no difference whatever in the records this year from the records kept by his predecessors for the last fifteen or twenty years.

Sir E. CARSON asked if the latest figures had been published.

Mr. BRYCE said they had not published the last quarterly return, but, of course, he was ready to give them at any time if they asked for them. As regarded agrarian outrages, the figures were forty for Galway and this year twenty; and the figures for all Ireland for the first six months of last year were 172, while for the same period this year they were only 127, a decline which was a good omen.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: How many people were under police protection?

Mr. BRYCE said he had not those figures by him, but he might say that they were giving protection on exactly the same terms and principles as were acted on by his predecessors, and that they were doing exactly as had been done before in preventing intimidation. They had always recognized that as one of their duties, and they were observing it exactly as their predecessors did. There had been various parts of Ireland where from time to time some little incidents had reminded them that old habits were not forgotten or unlearned even in better conditions, but every month, he thought, there was a certain measure of improvement. He did not wish to take the whole of the credit, though if they looked back over ten years there had been a great improvement, and he was very willing to allow that that improvement was largely due to the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the late Member for Leeds and to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover. There was still the difficulty that arose in the congested districts, and they were endeavouring to apply a remedy to that. The last action the Government had taken was to appoint a Commission to see what could be done to remedy the continual sources of trouble which arose from there being far more people on the ground than could live on it. They hoped the Commission would be able to devise a remedy for that state of things. This particular estate at Loughrea, which had been so long a focus of disorder, was a district where those conditions existed, and he hoped it was one of the very first estates that the Commission would have to consider. When they came to report he hoped the Commission would be able to suggest some means by which the difficulties that existed there and on other similar estates might be removed in a way which would do justice to all parties, and be the parent of permanent tranquility. He assured the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh that they wanted to govern Ireland as they governed Scotland and England and Wales, under the ordinary law, and to approximate more and more to that which made the law strong in those countries—the fact that it enjoyed the confidence of the people. He was glad to hear the right hon. and gallant Gentleman associate law and liberty. The difficulty was that in Ireland there had always been plenty of law and not enough liberty. There was a growing sense in Ireland that law should be respected, and a growing belief in the good faith and sympathy of the English and Scottish peoples and their desire to give Ireland the reforms which were still necessary.

MR. WALTER LONG said he only wished to enter his strong protest against the statement of the right hon. Gentleman at the beginning of his speech that no general indictment had been made by the Opposition of the policy of the Government.

MR. BRYCE said he had not complained of that; on the contrary, he was glad of it.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that the right hon. Gentleman made a statement that the Opposition had not made a general attack against the policy of the Irish Government. That was due, of course, to the fact that the Opposition had only obtained two and a half hours at the last moment, and with the utmost difficulty, to discuss one subject, which had been dealt with by his right hon. and gallant friend. The attitude of the Irish Unionists had been entirely misrepresented. It was not their desire or object to interfere with the present Irish Government, or with any body which was responsible for the government of Ireland, if they believed that by the adoption of a particular policy permanent peace was going to be secured. But they were not quite satisfied now that the right hon. Gentlman's calculations had a solid foundation. It was not a question of what the Under-Secretary had done; what he did was obviously done with the consent and approval of the Chief Secretary.

MR. BRYCE: Hear, hear.

MR. LONG: The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the condition of the Loughrea district was materially improved, but that was not the opinion of the learned Judge when he gave his charge. The right hon. Gentleman knew very well there were two kinds of oppression in Ireland—that which took the form of crime, and that much more difficult thing to deal with, boycotting—a system of a semi-private character which interfered with daily life and pursuits. When the right hon. Gentleman said there had been in Ireland too much law and too little freedom he wondered what kind of freedom he meant, and whether he meant the freedom of a man to interfere with others and coerce them against doing what they wanted to do, or the freedom of all men and all classes to follow out their own occupations so long as they kept within the law.

MR. BRYCE: Of course within the law.

MR. LONG hoped the right hon. Gentleman would keep that object in view. He believed there was in some districts an improvement, and he was glad to notice that the right hon. Gentleman admitted that it was not the creation of to-day, although he had thought fit to suggest that for the few months he himself was responsible for the Government of Ireland that improvement was not maintained.

MR. BRYCE said he really did not mean that.

MR. LONG said he regretted there was no further time in which to deal with so important a question.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 41; Noes, 240. (Division List No. 277.)

AYES

Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Marquess of Hamilton and Mr. Lonsdale.

NOES

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt Francis,
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
M'Veagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas

Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson, CharlesN(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A.H.(Ashton underLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds,S.)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 233 Noes, 38. (Division List No. 278).

AYES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(S'merset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn,SirJ Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis, William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St. PancrasN.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp

Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.)
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert Staffs. Leek)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim. S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W
Vivian Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (S'thampton)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boyle, Sir Edward
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Roland
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Valentia, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ashley and Viscount Turnour.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL. [LORDS.]

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton), who was very imperfectly heard, was understood to say that in order to give the required protection to all concerned in these contracts it was necessary to insert in the first clause in line 6 the words "of indemnity." He begged to move the insertion of those words, after the word "contract."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'contract,' to insert the words 'of indemnity.'"—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'of indemnity' be there inserted in the Bill."

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said the hon. Gentleman must be mistaken in thinking any such words necessary, because if he read the whole of the clause he would see that "the insurer undertakes to indemnify." He saw no occasion to adopt the words.

Question put, and negatived.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that many of the Amendments standing in his name upon the Paper were put down at the instance of the General Council of the Bar by whom this Bill had been considered. He had moved a number of Amendments suggested by that Council in the Standing Committee, where he was met most fairly by the Solicitor-General who had accepted many of the Amendments, but some of them had been withdrawn to be further considered on Report. The Amendments now on the Paper represented the Amendments so withdrawn in Committee with a few others which had been added for special reasons. He hoped that they would now be accepted by the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 11, line 11, after the word 'where,' to insert the words 'owing to the gross negligence or.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

SIR JOHN WALTON hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press this Amendment as it involved alterations in the law.

Amendments, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 39, at end to insert 'though he need not be interested when the insurance is effected.'"

"In page 3, line 2, to leave out 'it is immaterial that.'"

"In page 3, line 2, after 'may,' to insert 'recover, although he may.'"

"In page 3, line 35, to leave out Sub-sections (2) and (3), and insert, 'A mortgagee, consignee, or other person having an interest in the subject matter insured may insure on behalf and for the benefit of other persons interested as well as for his own benefit.'"

"In page 5, line 18, after 'risk,' to insert 'and in particular the fact that a policy is effected by way of re-insurance is material.'"

"In page 8, line 31, at beginning to insert 'Subject to the provisions of this Act, and.'"

"In page 11, line 3, to leave out from 'equipment' to end of sub-section, and insert 'the warranty in respect of such preparation or equipment is satified if at the commencement of each stage the ship is seaworthy in respect of such preparation or equipment for the purposes of that stage.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 15, line 29, to leave out from the words 'specie' to end of sub-section."

In page 16, line 25, to leave out from the word 'repairs,' to the word 'or,' in line 28, and insert 'no deduction is to be made in respect of general average contributions to those repairs payable by other interests, but deduction is to be made of contributions which would be payable by other interests towards necessary future expenses.'"

"In page 17, line 26, to leave out the words 'thereupon becomes entitled to,' and insert the words 'is entitled to take over.'" In page 17, line 29, to leave out sub-section (2); In page 17, line 37, to leave out the words 'abandonment,' and insert the words 'the casualty.'"

"In page 18, line 6, after the word 'against,' to insert the word 'and'; In page 18, line 7, leave out from 'loss,' to end of sub-section; In page 18, line 11, at beginning, to insert 'Expenses incurred by or on behalf of the assured for the safety or preservation of the ship insured other than general average and salvage charges, are called particular charges.'"

"In page 18, line 13, to leave out from the word 'charges,' to end of sub-section and insert the words 'incurred in preventing a loss by perils insured against may be recovered as a loss by those perils.'"

In page 18, line 36, to leave out the words 'is liable for a general average contribution or.' In page 19, line 19, after the second 'the' to insert 'rights and.'"

"In page 21, line 7, to leave out sub-section (4)."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 17, to leave out from the word "case" to end of sub section."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Mr. CAVE said he desired to acknowledge the way in which the Attorney-General had accepted the Amendments.

*Sir JOHN WALTON said he readily accepted the Amendments. The Bill represented the efforts of lawyers to codify this part of the law.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

REVENUE BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (No. 2) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of July 13th.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLXI.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Alkali, &c., Works	*Earl Carrington*	Read 3^o and passed 23rd July (649)
Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1^a 19th July (344) Read 2^a 26th July (1371)
*Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	Read 1^a 26th July (1370)
*Crown Lands	*Marquess of Ripon*	Read 1^a 26th July (1370)
*Deanery of Manchester	*Marquess of Ripon*	Read 1^a 24th July (899)
*Dean Forest	*Lord Denman*	Read 1^a 23rd July (643)
*Dogs	*Earl Carrington*	Read 1^a 26th July (1370)
*Education of Defective Children (Scotland)	*Lord Balfour*	Royal Assent 20th July (533)
*Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs	*Earl Carrington*	Read 1^a 19th July (344)
Ground Game	*Lord Burghclere*	Report 20th July (537)
Indian Railways Act Amendment	*Earl Beauchamp*	Royal Assent 20th July (533)
*Isle of Man (Customs)	*Marquess of Ripon*	Read 1^a 19th July (344)
*Labourers (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	Read 1^a 24th July (899)
Marriage Act Amendment [H.L.]	*Viscount Ridley*	Read 1^a 24th July (899)
*Marriage with Foreigners	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 1^a 20th July (537)
Municipal Corporations	*Earl of Stamford*	Royal Assent 20th July (533)

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Open Spaces	*Earl Carrington*	Read 1^a 20th July (537)
*Post Office (Literature for the Blind)	*Earl Granard*	Read 1^a 26th July (1371)
*Post Office Sites	*Earl Granard*	Read 1^a 19th July (344) Read 2^a 26th July (1371)
Public Slaughter Houses [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 1^a 19th July (344)
*Reserve Forces	*Earl of Portsmouth*	Royal Assent 20th July (533)
*Statute Law Revision (Scotland)	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1^a 19th July (344) Read 2^a 26th July (1371)
*Wireless Telegraphy	*Earl Granard*	Royal Assent 20th July (533)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Absent Voters (Scotland)	*Mr. Alexander Black*	Read 1^o 17th July (41)
Access to Mountains (Scotland)	*Mr. Annan Boyce*	Read 1^o 23rd July (741)
Architects' Registration	*Mr. Atherley Jones*	Read 1^o 25th July (1221)
*Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment	*Sir J. Walton*	Consideration Read 3^o and passed } 18th July (338)
*Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland)	*Mr. Cherry*	Consideration Read 3^o and passed } 24th July (1176)
Church Discipline (No. 2)	*Mr. A. Taylor*	Read 1^o 19th July (418)
Conveyancing [H.L.]	*Mr. Micklem*	Read 1^o 25th July (1221)
*Criminal Appeal	*Sir J. Walton*	Read 1^o 18th July (217)
*Crown Lands	*Mr. McKenna*	Committee Report } 24th July (1176) Read 3^o and passed 25th July (1367)
*Dangerous Performances	*Mr. H. Samuel*	Bill withdrawn 25th July (1368)
*Deanery of Manchester	*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*	Read 2^o 19th July (500) Committee Report Read 3^o and passed } 23rd July (830)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Dean Forest	*Mr. McKenna*	Committee Report Read 3° and passed 20th July (638)
*Dogs	*Sir E. Strachey*	Consideration Read 3° and passed 24th July (1154)
*Education (England and Wales)	*Mr. Birrell*	Committee 17th July (41) Committee 18th „ (218) Report 23rd „ (741) Report 24th „ (1058) Report 25th „ (1222)
Education of Defective Children (Scotland)	*Mr. Gulland*	Royal Assent 20th July (562)
Explosives	*Mr. Hay*	Read 1° 19th July (419)
*Extradition [H.L.]	*Sir Edward Grey*	Read 2° 18th July (339) Committee Report Read 3° and passed 19th July (529)
*Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs	*Sir E. Strachey*	Read 3° and passed 18th July (332)
*Indian Railways Act Amendment	*Mr. J. Ellis*	Royal Assent 20th July (562)
*Infectious Diseases (Ireland)	*Mr. Bryce*	Read 2° 24th July (1176)
*Isle of Man Customs	*Mr. McKenna*	Committee Report 17th July (147)
*Labourers (Ireland)	*Mr. Bryce*	Consideration Read 3° and passed 23rd July (835)
*Land Tax Commissioners	*Mr. McKenna*	Read 2° 20th July (639)
Land Tenure (Scotland)	*Mr. M. Ferguson*	Read 1° 23rd July (741)
*Lunacy (Ireland)	*Mr. Bryce*	Bill Withdrawn 25th July (1368)
*Marine Insurance [H.L.]	*Sir J. Walton*	Consideration Read 3° and passed 26th July (1557)
*Marriage with Foreigners	*Mr. H. Samuel*	Read 2° 18th July (339) Committee Report Read 3° and passed 19th July (525)
Married Women's Property [H.L.]	*Mr. Micklem*	Read 1° 25th July (1221)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Municipal Corporations	*Mr. Vivian*	Royal Assent 20th July (562)
*Musical Copyright	*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*	Consideration 19th July (502)
*Open Spaces	*Sir E. Strachey*	Consideration Read 3° and passed } 19th July (501)
*Post Office (Literature for the Blind)	*Mr. Sydney Buxton*	Read 1° 18th July (218) Read 2° 20th July (638) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 25th July (1363)
*Post Office Sites	*Mr. Sydney Buxton*	Read 3° and passed 17th July (142)
*Prevention of Corruption	*Sir J. Walton*	Consideration 17th July (148)
Railway Contracts	*Mr. Hooper*	Read 1° 25th July (1221)
*Reserve Forces	*Mr. Haldane*	Royal Assent 20th July (562)
*Revenue	*Mr. McKenna*	Read 2° 18th July (319) Committee 25th July (1365) Report Read 3° and passed } 26th July (1560)
Settled Lands [H.L.]	*Mr. Micklem*	Read 1° 25th July (1221)
*Statute Law Revision (Scotland)	*Mr. T. Shaw*	Read 3° and passed 17th July (160)
Textile Workers (Saturday and Sunday Holiday)	*Mr. Jowett*	Read 1° 17th July (41)
*Wireless Telegraphy	*Mr. Sydney Buxton*	Royal Assent 20th July (562)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1906.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in previous Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Public Records (The Palace Court),—Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents belonging to the abolished Court of the King's Palace at Westminster which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	18 July	4 weeks
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Councils of the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees and of the County Borough of Wigan and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the Hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Boroughs [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	19 July	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Royal Leamington Spa and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	20 July	40 days
Education (Scotland),—Copy of Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated 19th July, 1906, providing for Special Grants in aid of certain School Boards in Scotland [35 and 36 Vic., c. 62, s. 65]	23 July	One month
Prisons (Ireland),—Copy of Order in Council approving of Rules made by the General Prisons Board, providing that certain privileges may be earned by Convicts through industry and good conduct in Prison [40 and 41 Vic., c. 49, s. 57 (c)]	24 July	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Nelson and confirmed, with certain amendments, by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for Barbers' and Hairdressers' Shops within the Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)].	26 July	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1906.

JULY 17—*JULY* 26.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
  Kingston Estate Sale Proposals, *July 19*, 357.

Absent Voters (Scotland) Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 17*, 41.

Access to Mountains (Scotland) Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 23*, 741.

Accrington
  Hyndburn Park School, Decision as to.
    Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 182.

Achscrabster
  Allotments Scheme, Costs connected with.
    Q. Mr. R. L. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 25*, 1179.

Acland, Mr. F. D. [Yorks, Richmond]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 218, 219.

Adkins, Mr. W. R. [Lancashire, Middleton]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 254–256, 271, 274, 275, 281, 287; *Con.*, *July 24*, 1081, 1082; *July 25*, 1240–1242.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
  Financial Secretary — Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

Afforestation
  See under Forestry.

Africa, Central
  Post Office, Parcel Post Amendment Warrant Presented, *July 17*, 4.

Africa, East
  See also names of Places.
  British coinage, Use of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1035.
  Post Office Parcel Post Amendment Warrant Presented, *July 17*, 4.

Africa, South
  See also names of Colonies.
  British Indians, Rights of.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19*, 382, 383.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 719.
  Coolie or Lascar, Definition of.
    Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 1189.
  Native, Definition of, in Vereeniging Treaty, etc.
    Qs. Mr. H. Cox, Mr. Rees, Mr. Myer, Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 23*, 715, 716.

[*cont.*

Africa, South—*cont.*
Garrison in, Proposals as to Reduction of.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 24*, 945, 946.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 176.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 377.
Milk, Skimmed, Import Duty on.
Q. Mr. Wills; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 709, 710.
Self-government Proposals
Commission of Inquiry, Cost of, and date of Presenting Report.
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 720.
Qs. Mr. Lyttelton; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 734, 735.
Opportunity for discussing Policy of the Government, etc.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Major Seely; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 17*, 39, 40.

Africa, West
See also names of Places.
Freight Rates to, etc.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1451, 1452.
Portuguese Islands of San Thomé and Principé, Labour Conditions in.
Q. Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 193.

Agricultural Organisation Society (Irish)
Grants to, from Agriculture Department—Return Presented, *July 20*, 564.

Agricultural Rates Act
Payments under, Basis of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 26*, 1431.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Report, (1905) Presented, *July 26*, 1410.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *con.*, *July 24*, 1147.
Trawlers, Foreign in Prohibited Waters, Decision of Sheriff Guthrie as to, *July 25*, 1197.

Aland Islands
Russian Military Occupation of.
Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 1190.

Alcohol
Industrial Use of, Legislation to facilitate.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 320–323; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 330; Mr. Asquith, 330.

Alcohol—*cont.*
Surtax on Foreign Imported Alcohol, Removal of.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 322.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Congo Free State—Result of Trial of Mr. Stannard, *July 19*, 392; *July 24*, 1038.
Natal Native Rising.
Bishop of Zululand's Charges, Investigation of, *July 26*, 1447.
Conduct of Native Levies, etc., *July 19*, 390.
Inquiry into Conduct of Military Operations, Proposed, *July 23*, 720.
Unemployed
Afforestation as a Solution of the Problem, *July 19*, 446.
Dock, Casual and Unskilled Labour, Proposals for Dealing with, *July 19*, 444, 445.
Farm and Labour Colonies, Experiments with, *July 19*, 448.
Labour Bureaux, Establishment of, Proposed, *July 19*, 446, 447.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill
*c. Con.** *July 17*, 13.
3R.* *July 20*, 563.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 24*, 897.

Aliens
Passengers from Ports in Europe, etc., and Expulsion Orders Made (April–June, 1906) Return as to, Presented, *July 18*, 162; *July 19*, 343.

Alkali, &c., Works Bill
l. Report from Standing Committee, *July 17*, 5.
3R., *July 23*, 649.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
Army Tailors and Shoemakers, Boys Enlisted as—Regulation as to Continuing at Trade, *July 24*, 1027.
Education Bill
Religious Instruction—Books and Apparatus, Provision of, *July 24*, 1022.
State-Aided Schools Under Clause 4, Effect of Clause 26 upon, *July 24*, 1021.
Opium Revenue Farming System, Restrictions on in Straits Settlement, etc., *July 19*, 388.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Lucan Estate—Disposal of Pontoon Portion, *July 26*, 1442.

Ampthill, Lord
- Army.
  - Expenditure, Reduction in, Necessity for, *July 24*, 992.
  - Re-organisation Proposals, *July 24*, 991–994.
- Militia, Foreign Service for, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 993, 994.

Anney
- Police Domiciliary Visits, Reason of. *Q.* Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1441.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 63–65, 76, 82, 83, 89, 105, 108–112; *July 18*, 222, 224, 256–258, 272, 274, 276, 281, 284, 287, 293; *Con.*, *July 23*, 752–754, 760, 807–811; *July 24*, 1059, 1079–1081, 1112, 1130, 1137; *July 25*, 1222, 1223, 1286, 1287, 1298–1300.

Anstruther Harbour
- Improvement, Proposals as to. *Q.* Mr. F. Williamson; *A.* Mr. Mc Kenna, *July 24*, 1017.

Anstruther-Gray, Maj. [St. Andrews Burghs.]
- Army.
  - Bayonet, New, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1426.
  - *Personnel*, Reduction Proposals, *July 19*, 498, 499.
  - Piershill Barracks, Sanitary Condition of, *July 26*, 1126.
- Duke of York's School Site, Decision as to Disposal of, *July 26*, 1426.
- Militia Camp Equipment, Regulations as to taking Over—Weight of Equipment Issued to Fife Artillery, etc., *July 23*, 696.
- Rosyth Naval Base, Policy as to, *July 26* 1412.
- Saturday Sitting, Business to be Taken on *July 24*, 1029.

Anthrax
- Deaths from—Dealing with Dangerous Wool at Port of Entry, proposed. *Qs.* Mr. Jowett; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 24*, 1041.

Architects' Registration Bill
- c. 1R.* *July 25*, 1221.

Ardara
- Postal Facilities, Improvement of. *Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 181.

Arklow Harbour
- Works, Grant for, etc. *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1421.

Arkwright, Mr. J. S. [Hereford]
- Africa, West—Labour Conditions in San Thomé and Principé, *July 18*, 193.

Armitstead of Castlehill, Baron
- Introduced to House of Lords, *July 23* 641.

Army
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Earl of Portsmouth.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
- Artillery
  - Conservative Government Policy as to. *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 902–905; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1001–1003.
  - Importance of, Necessity for maintaining full strength in men and guns, etc.
    - *Os.* Earl of Denbigh, *July 24*, 956–966; Lord Tweedmouth, 966; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1001–1004; Marquess of Ripon, 1010.
  - Militia Garrison, utilising for ammunition columns.
    - *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 910; Earl of Portsmouth, 943, 944; Earl of Denbigh, 962–964.
  - Reorganisation of, Proposals as to. *Os.* Earl of Portsmouth, *July 24*, 943–945; Earl of Denbigh, 956–966; Lord Tweedmouth, 963–966; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1001–1005; Marquess of Ripon, 1009, 1010.
  - Reserve, Proposals as to. *Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1025, 1026.
  - Royal Field, Effect of Reductions on. *Q.* Major McMicking; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 176.
  - Strength of. *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 902, 903; Earl of Portsmouth, 943, 944.
  - Terms of Service in, Alteration of. *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 905; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1003.
- Auxiliary Forces (*see also subheadings* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry).
  - Reorganisation of, Proposals as to. *Os.* Lord Grimthorpe, *July 24*, 990; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1004, 1005.
- Ballykinlor Camp—Damage done to roads in vicinity. *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1183.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Bayonet, Selection of Pattern for.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26,* 1426.

Canteens, System of supplying—Case of Messrs. R. Dickeson & Co.
Qs. Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23,* 708, 709.

Civil Employment of ex-soldiers, proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 173, 174.

Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*

Contracts, *see under* War Office.

Defence of the Empire, *see that title.*

Efficiency, Necessity for maintaining.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 24,* 970.

Establishment, strength of.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 24,* 969.

Expeditionary Force, Proposals as to.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24,* 902; Earl of Portsmouth, 942; Lord Tweedmouth, 972, 973; Earl of Errol, 996.

Expenditure
Appropriation Accounts, referring to Committee.
Motion [Mr. McKenna], *July 19,* 532.

Reduction of, Necessity for.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 24,* 939, 940; Viscount Goschen, 983, 984; Lord Grimthorpe, 988; Lord Ampthill, 992; Marquess of Ripon, 1012.

General Staff, Proposals as to organising.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 377.

Guards
Coldstream Guards, Third Battalion—Proposals as to despatch to Egypt.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 365, 366.
Q. Mr. J. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 177.
Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 25,* 1185.

Cost of, compared with the Line.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24,* 906, 947; Earl Temple, 916; Earl of Portsmouth, 947.

Reduction of, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. C. Hobhouse, *July 19,* 476, 477, 497, 498; Colonel Lockwood, 497, 498; Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24,* 906; Earl Temple, 916–919; Earl of Portsmouth, 946–948; Lord Grimthorpe, 988; Earl of Errol, 996, 997; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1000, 1001; Marquess of Ripon, 1008, 1009.
Qs. Mr. G. Baring; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24,* 1030.

Army—*cont.*

Home Battalions, Proposals as to Reduction of.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 415, 470, 484, 489; Mr. F. E. Smith, 469, 470; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 489, 490; Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24,* 907.

Horses, Age for Purchase of.
Q. Mr. H. R. Mansfield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 171, 172.

Indian, *see under* India.

Jordan, Case of—Reason for reinstatement as Quartermaster-Sergeant.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 176, 177.

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Mobilisation, Troops available for, in 1899, etc.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 368.

Ordnance Factories—Accident, etc., Pay, Provision of Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24,* 1033.

Pensions—weekly payment proposed.
Q. Mr. H. R. Mansfield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 17,* 24, 25.

Personnel

Reduction Proposals.
Os. Lord Castlereagh, *July 19,* 474; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 474–478; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 492; Major Seely, 492, 493; Sir H. Vincent, 494–497; Major Anstruther-Gray, 498, 499; Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24,* 899, 913, 915, 1012; Earl Roberts, 919–921; Earl of Portsmouth, 939, 940, 945, 946; Earl of Meath, 952; Lord Newton, 977–979; Earl of Erroll, 995; Marquess of Lansdowne, 998–1001, 1005, 1006; Marquess of Ripon, 1006.
Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 173.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24,* 1030.

Date of giving Directions for Disbandment.
Q. Lord J. Joicey Cecil; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 367.

Deficiency in Regiments Selected for, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Smith; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 174, 175.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Personnel—cont.
Reduction Proposals—*cont.*
Eight Battalions.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 907–909; Earl of Portsmouth, 945.
Qs. Mr. Arnold Forster; *As.* Mr. Haldane, Mr. Speaker, *July 25*, 1187, 1188.
Officers and Men of Disbanded Battalions, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 184.
Sanction of Parliament to, Obtaining, prior to giving effect to Scheme.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *July 19*, 418, 464–467; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 479–482, 486; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 488–491; Major Seely, 491, 492.
Ten Battalions, Proposals as to—Statement (Mr. Haldane), *July 19*, 414, 415.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 19*, 414, 415.
Vote, Estimated Saving in, etc.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Sir H. Vinent, Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 706–708.
Wastage, Allowance for.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 913.
Piershill Barracks, Insanitary Condition of, alleged.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1425.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1426.
Plain Clothes—Sergeants, Date of Issuing Instructions as to.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1443.
Pressley, Sergeant T., Case of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1425.
Recruiting & Enlistment, Statistics for 1904.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 17*, 25.
Reorganisation Proposals.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *July 19*, 467–471; Mr. Haldane, 486, 487; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 489–491; Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 901–916; Earl Roberts, 919–931; Earl of Portsmouth, 939–949; Viscount Hardinge, 949–952; Lord Tweedmouth, 966–975; Lord Newton, 975–983; Viscount Goschen, 983–986; Lord Grimthorpe, 986–991; Lord Ampthill, 991–994; Earl of Errol, 994–998; Marquess of Lansdowne, 998–1006.

Army—*cont.*
Reorganisation Proposals—*cont.*
Army Council, Opinion of.
Os. Lord Castlereagh, *July 19*, 472; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 477; Viscount Goschen, *July 24*, 984, 985; Lord Grimthorpe, 989; Marquess of Lansdowne, 999; Marquess of Ripon, 1007.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1031, 1032.
Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *July 19*, 465–467; Lord Castlereagh, 472–474; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 478–482; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 480; Mr. Haldane, 482–488; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 488–491; Sir H. Vincent, 495; Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 900, 916.
Reserve
Number of
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 368.
Transfers under new system.
Qs. Colonel Long; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 695, 696.
Rifles, Contracts for—Defective Rifles, Understanding as to.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1033.
Short Tour, Battalions Serving on.
Q. Lord Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 173.
Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory.
Employees, Refusal of Re-employment to, alleged.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1032, 1033.
Tailors and Shoemakers, Boys Enlisted as—Regulation as to continuing at Trade.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1027.
Territorial Army
Committee, Date of presenting Report of.
Q. Mr. Meysey-Thompson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 369.
Scheme, Proposals as to.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1427.
Unpreparedness for War.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 24*, 919–931.
Voluntary System, Defects of.
Os. Lord Roberts, *July 24*, 922–931.
War Office, *see that title.*
Wastage—Statistics for certain battalions in 1904 and 1905.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 366.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Woolwich Arsenal
Discharges (1903–1906).
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23,* 680.
Qs. Mr. Henderson, Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23,* 706.
Officials recently appointed, Annual cost of.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23,* 705.

Army Estimates
Discussion, Opportunity for.
Qs. Mr. F. E. Smith; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 19,* 413.
Statement made to *Times* representative by Member for Croydon.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 414, 415; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 414; Mr. Speaker, 414.
Savings and Deficiences on Grants for 1904–5—Committee to Consider. *Resolution* (Mr. M'Kenna), *July 19,* 532.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
Army
Home Battalions, Proposals as to Reduction of, *July 19,* 489, 490.
Mobilisation—Troops Available for, in 1899, *July 19* 368.
Personnel.
Eight Battalions, proposals as to, *July 25,* 1187, 1188.
Reductions—Sanction of Parliament to, Obtaining Prior to giving Effect to Scheme, *July 19,* 488–491.
Re-organisation Proposals, *July 19,* 489–491.
Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, *July 19,* 488–491.
Reservists, Number of, *July 19,* 368.
Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24,* 1171.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 17,* 118.
Imperial Defence Committee Vote, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 18,* 216.
Natal Native Rising—Bambaata, Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of, *July 18,* 190, 191.
Charges Against Major Platt, *July 26,* 1449.
Identity of Officer Responsible, etc., *July 24,* 1031.
Volunteers—Lanark and 4th West Riding Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 19,* 368.

Artillery
See under Army.

Arva
Mulligan, Mr., Eviction of—Police Assistance, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25,* 1183, 1184.
Q. Mr. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25,* 1216, 1217.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 19,* 352.

Ashbourne, Lord
Congested Districts—Commission of Inquiry, Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc., *July 23,* 661, 662.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool].
Africa, East—British Coinage, Use of, proposed, *July 24,* 1035.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July* 17, 92; *July* 18, 251; *July* 24, 1058.
Morocco — Sale of Land to Foreigners, regulations as to, *July 26,* 1453, 1454.
Slave-Trading, Powers of Police in Coast Towns to Stop, *July 17,* 31.
Preston Post Office Staff, Proposals for Revision of, *July 17,* 34.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]
Alcohol, Industrial Use of—Legislation to Facilitate, *July 18,* 330.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 17,* 61–63.
Gambling in Shares—Protection of Shareholders from Bull and Bear Operations, etc., *July 17,* 21.
Income Tax
Committee, Extension of Terms of Reference proposed, *July 24,* 1023.
Monetary Prizes, Liability of, *July 23,* 724.
Sums Collected at end of Financial Year, Procedure as to, *July 23,* 723.
Inland Revenue Accounts—Bank at which kept, *July 23,* 724.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23,* 873, 874.
Motors, Taxing in Proportion to Horsepower, proposed, *July 23,* 681.
Revenuel Bill, 2R., *July 18,* 330, 331; *Com., July 25,* 1366.
Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland—Special Facilities and Fiscal Remissions granted for Encouragement of, *July 18,* 331.

[*cont.*

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
Treasury Bills—Balances at Bank of England, securing Payment of Interest on, proposed, *July 18*, 331.
Wines, British, use of foreign Grape "Must" in manufacture of—Registration of Manufacturers, *July 18*, 330.

Assam
Bengal, Eastern, *see under* India.
Udoya Patni, Circumstances of Execution of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 17*, 25, 26.

Athenry
Caheroyan Property, Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1422, 1423.

Attorney-General
Sir J. Lawson Walton.

Attorney-General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Aughnacloy
Police, extra, on 12th July, Reason for Employment of, etc.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 357.

Australasia
[*For particular Colonies, etc., see their names.*]
Naval Force, Local, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 215, 216.

Autumn Session
See under Parliamentary Procedure—Session.

Bacup Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 20*, 536.

Baghdad Railway
Information as to.
Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 24*, 1037, 1038.

Bahr-el Ghazal
See under Soudan.

Baker, Mr. J. A. [Finsbury, E.]
Belgrade and Sofia—Decision as to Establishment of Bank, etc., *July 17*, 32.
Opium Trade, Indo-Chinese and Indo-Burmese, Proposals for reform of, *July 17*, 26, 27.

Baker, Sir J. [Portsmouth]
Naval Dockyard Wages, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 166.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 17*, 2.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 24*, 670.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, N., Chorley]
Carnarvan Castle, Proposals as to restoring, *July 1* , 375.
Education Code—Subjects dealt with in explanatory Memorandum, *July 25*, 1196.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 81, 98–100; *July 18* 218, 220, 222–224, 246, 258–262, 270, 286; *Con.*, *July 23*, 755, 756, 798; *July 24*, 1103, 1109, 1110, 1115, 1127–1129; *July 25*, 1258–1259, 1276, 1279, 1280.
Religious Instruction, Payment of Expenses of, *July 19*, 406.
State-aided Schools as Public Elementary Schools, Decision as to, *July 20*, 569.
Welsh Officials, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1022.
Extradition Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 530.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [London]
Africa, South—Self Government Proposals, Opportunity for discussing, etc., *July 17*, 39, 40.
Army
Personnel—Reduction Proposals, *July 19*, 492.
Opportunity for adequate Discussion of, *July 19*, 478–482.
Sanction of Parliament to, obtaining prior to giving Effect to Scheme, *July 19*, 479–482, 486.
Army Estimates, further time for Discussion of—Statement made to *Times* Representative by Member for Croydon, *July 19*, 414.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 24*, 1056.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 56–61, 74, 78–81, 86–88, 95, 96, 114–116, 229, 233–238, 263; *Con.*, *July 23*, 745–747, 758, 769–775; *July 24*, 1061, 1070–1072, 1100, 1124 1130, 1131, 1132; *July 25*, 1228–1233, 1270.
Irish Estimates, Opportunity for Discussing—Order of Taking Votes, etc., *July 19*, 416; *July 23*, 740.
Personal Explanation Traversing Members' Statement, Right of Reply to, *July 19*, 414.

Balfour, Mr. R. [Lanark, Partick]
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill—Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17*, 130.

Ballinrobe
Canal to Lough Mask, Completion of, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 360.
Light Railway to Claremorris
Additional Trains and better Accommodation, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 410.
Representation of Guarantors on Board of Directors.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 359.

Ballykinlor Camp
See under Army.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [London, City of]
Army—Territorial Scheme, Proposals as to, *July 26*, 1427.
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1157, 1165, 1166.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Minister for Wales, Information as to, *July 23*, 732.
Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1146, 1147.
Greenwich Observatory, Proposals as to, *July 25*, 1185.
Land Tax Commissioners Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 639.
Militia—Compulsory Service Abroad, Legislative Proposals for Authorising, *July 24*, 1027.
Motor Speed—Privileges of Cabinet Ministers, etc., *July 23*, 725, 726.

Baring, Mr. G. V. [Winchester]
Army—Guards, Proposals as to Reduction of, *July 24*, 1030.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1149.
Unemployed Problem, Method of Dealing with—Question of Agricultural Districts, etc., *July 19*, 459.

Barnes, Mr. J. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Power to Provide Eyeglasses under Clause 35, *July 18*, 170.
Spain—Charge against Engineer of "Gravina" at Valencia, *July 26*, 1430.

Barran, Mr. R. H. [Leeds, N.]
Companies—Penalties for not Filing Returns, *July 25*, 1193.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 149.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Administration of Ireland—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26*, 1536.
Education—"Two-teacher" School, Definition of, *July 24*, 1025.
Poor Law Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 24*, 1049; *July 26*, 1527, 1528.
Royal Commissions on Irish Questions, Constitution of, *July 26*, 1536, 1537.

Barrow River
Drainage Proposals.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1025.

Barry Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 296; *Con.*, *July 23*, 797, 800.
"Montagu," H.M.S., Expenditure on Salving, *July 24*, 1029.

Beauchamp, Earl
Motor Omnibuses, Noise, Annoyance and Injury Caused by, in London, *July 20*, 551, 552.

Beauchamp, Mr. H. W. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
Navy Shipbuilding Programme of Foreign Nations, *July 24*, 1017.

Bedford, Duke of
Defence of the Empire—Expansion outside Limit of RegularForces, Necessity for, *July 24*, 932, 933.
Militia
Conditions of Service, *July 24*, 931, 933–939.
Drafting, Withdrawal of Immunity from, *July 24*, 933–939.
Foreign Service for, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 933, 934, 936, 937.
Functions of, *July 24*, 932, 933.
Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 931.

Belfast
Corporation Stock in name of Deceased person, Procedure in Selling.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 704.
Post Office
Holiday for Postmen on 12th July, Proposed.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1411; *July 26*, 1436.

[*cont.*

Belfast—*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Mail Van Drivers, Conditions of Service of
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1436.

Promotions in, Protest against.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1435, 1436.

Belgium

Post Office Parcel Post Amendment (No. 19), Warrant Presented, *July 17*, 4.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]

Bermuda Floating Dock—Date of Arrival, Occasions of Using, etc., *July 23*, 704.

German Navy, Guns used in, *July 18*, 185.

Navy

Bases, Defence of—Transfer to Admiralty, etc., *July 26*, 1477.

Battleships

Eight Battleships in Full Commission, Cost of, *July 17*, 23.

Reconstruction of Vessels Launched prior to 1889, *July 17*, 24.

Expenditure of Naval Powers—Information to be given in return, *July 25*, 1185.

Gun Reserve, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1016.

Benn, Sir J. W. [Devonport]

Devonport Dockyard, Overtime worked at, *July 19*, 371.

Trawlers, Foreign, Protection of Fishing Grounds from—Services of H.M.S. Julia, etc., *July 25*, 1180.

Beresford Estate

Sale of—Inspector's Report, etc.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 409, 410; *July 26*, 1422.

Bermuda

Floating Dock—Date of Arrival, Occasions of using, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Lambert; *July 23*, 704, 705.

Berridge, Mr. T. H. D. [Warwick and Leamington]

Revenue Bill, *Com.*, *July 25*, 1366.

Bertram, Mr. J. [Herts, Hitchin]

Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 505, 506.

Railway Rating Basis, Legislation to alter—Finding of Court in Hertfordshire, etc., *July 26*, 1461.

Bills

Private

Metropolitan Borough Councils' Expenses during Session—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 26*, 1432.

Reports of Board of Trade—Alleged Insufficient Number furnished to Unopposed Bill Committee.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 399.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill

c. *Con.** *July 18*, 337.
3R., *July 18*, 337, 338.
l. 1R* *July 19*, 344.
2R., *July 26*, 1371.

Billson, Mr. A. [Staffordshire, N.W.]

Post Office Halfpenny Post—Returning Business Documents Free of Charge if not Delivered, proposed, *July 19*, 403.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*President, Board of Education* [Bristol, N.]

Accrington—Decision as to Hyndburn Park, *July 18*, 182.

Blackburn Pupil Teacher Centre, Reason for recommending Abolition of, *July 18*, 169.

Children of one Local Education Authority Educated by another, Payment for, *July 17*, 20.

Code—Subjects dealt with in Explanatory Memorandum, *July 25*, 1195, 1196.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 92–95, 98; *July 18*, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226–230, 245–251, 268, 269, 271, 288, 290; *Con.*, *July 23*, 744, 795, 804, 809, 825, 828; *July 24*, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1162, 1168–1070, 1089, 1090, 1092, 1094, 1099, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1111, 1114, 1118, 1134, 1138–1140; *July 25*, 1233–1235, 1267–1270, 1275, 1276, 1278.

Act of 1870, Re-enactment of Section 87, proposed, *July 26*, 1434.

Amendments to Clauses 2 and 4 proposals as to, *July 23*, 733.

Local Education Authorities' Travelling Expenses, Payment of, proposed, *July 26*, 1433.

Medical Inspection—Power to provide Eyeglasses under Clause 35, *July 18*, 170.

Minister for Wales, Information as to, *July 23*, 732.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

Religious Instruction

Books and Apparatus, Provision of, *July 24*, 1022.

Separate Arrangement with Existing Teachers, Powers of Managers to make, *July 17*, 20.

State-aided Schools as Public Elementary Schools, Decision as to, *July 20*, 569.

State-aided Schools under Clause 4, Effect of Clause 26 upon, *July 24*, 1022.

Welsh Officials, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1022.

Fees, Elementary Schools charging, *July 23*, 732.

Free Education, Right to Claim, *July 26*, 1464.

Jarrow-on-Tyne Secondary School Fees, *July 26*, 1465.

London County Council proposals as to New End and Deansfield Road Schools, *July 26*, 1434.

Register of Teachers, proposals as to Establishing, *July 19*, 371.

Religious Instruction—Schools in which no Religious Instruction is given, *July 17*, 20.

Salford—Decision as to Charging Fees in Devonshire Street Council School, *July 19*, 371.

School Buildings Improvements, etc., Delay in Sanctioning, pending Passing of Bill proposed, *July 18*, 182.

Schools Certified efficient, Number, etc., of, *July 17*, 34.

South Kensington Museum, Arrangements for Loan of Works of Art from, *July 23*, 700.

Teachers

Pupil

Grants for, under Article 27, *July 23*, 731.

Training Centres, Decision as to Closing, *July 18*, 198.

Vaccination, Regulations as to, *July 19*, 405.

Salaries, Increases of, *July 25*, 1184.

Training Colleges, Abolition of Denominationalism in, proposed, *July 23*, 730, 731.

Twickenham Urban District Council Powers as to Inquiry into Religious Denomination of Teachers, *July 23*, 700.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]

Education—*Status of* Pupil Teachers after 1914, *July 17*, 37.

Blackburn

Pupil Teacher Centre, Reason for Recommending Abolition of.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 169.

Blake Estate

Grazing Farm, Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 357, 358.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]

Cooscroum Landing Place, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1048.

Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1167, 1172, 1173.

Education

Extern Teachers, Rules as to, *July 18*, 209.

Pupil Teachers, Grant for, under Article 27, *July 23*, 731.

School Building Plans, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1052.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 220, 221, 222.

Export trade, Irish, Returns as to proposed, *July 24*, 1047.

Malta—Regulations in Valletta as to Religious Processions, *July 19*, 386.

Reenard Pier improvements, decision as to, *July 25*, 1181.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Borneo

Brunei affairs, present position of.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, Sir. C. Dilke *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1454, 1455.

Botanical Gardens

Grants to, Admission on Sundays, etc.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1468, 1469.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]

Criminal offences, etc., Returns, omission of names of acquitted persons from, proposed, *July 18*, 194.

Natal Native Rising—Military operations, conduct of, British Government Representations proposed, *July 23*, 714.

Police, Inquiries by—Employment of men in plain clothes, proposed, *July 18*, 193, 194.

Servian Regicide Officers, text of Decree as to retirement of, *July 19*, 392.

Workmen's Compensation Act—Power of Judge to reduce allowance, *July 23*, 728.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
  Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill, 3R., *July 17*, 332–334.
  Naval Gunnery practice in the North Sea — Alleged waste of Ammunition by Sheerness Reserve Division, *July 18*, 184.
  Turkey—Increase in Customs duties, effect of, *July 26*, 1455.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
  Education—Schools certified efficient, number of, etc., *July 17*, 34.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 17*, 86, 106, 107; *July 18*, 281, *Con., July 23*, 788, 828, 829, *July 24*, 1113, 1123; *July 25*, 1266, 1267.

Bristol
  Post Office—Messrs. Bicknell and Setter, Duties of.
    Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 1016.

Bristol Corporation Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 535.
  3R.* *July 24*, 897.

Brixham Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Brodie, Mr. H. C. [Surrey, Reigate]
  Vagrancy Committee Recommendations, proposals as to adopting, *July 19*, 372.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Aberdeen, S.]
  Administration of Ireland—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26*, 1546, 1549.
  Anney, Reason of Police Domiciliary Visits to, *July 26*, 1441.
  Arklow Harbour Works, grant for, *July 26*, 1421.
  Arva—Police Assistance at eviction of Mr. Mulligan, *July 25*, 1184, 1217.
  Athenry—Caheroyan property, purchase of, proposed, *July 26*, 1423.
  Aughnacloy extra police force, Reason for employing, *July 19*, 357.
  Ballinrobe
    Canal, Completion of, proposed, *July 19*, 360.
    Light Railway to Claremorris—Representations of Guarantors on board of Directors, *July 19*, 359.
  Ballykinlar Camp, damage done to roads in vicinity of, *July 25*, 1183.
  Barrow River Drainage proposals, *July 24*, 1025.

Bryce Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Belfast Corporation Stock in name of deceased person, Procedure in selling, *July 23*, 704.
  Beresford Estate, sale of—Inspector's Report, etc., *July 19*, 410; *July 26*, 1422.
  Blake Estate grazing farm, Purchase of, proposed, *July 19*, 358.
  Boycotting, etc., Cases Reported to police in 1906, *July 18*, 205.
  Brehon Laws Commission, Work of—Translation of Remaining Documents, proposed, *July 23*, 678, 679.
  Caldbeck Estate—proposals as to Sale of Ballacolla, *July 23*, 703.
  Cavan
    Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstating, *July 25*, 1200, 1201.
    Magistracy, Information as to, *July 25*, 1203.
  Chearnley, Major, Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of J. Keane, *July 23*, 689.
  Clanmorris Estate, Sale of—Charges against Messrs. Good & Black, *July 19*, 362.
  Clanricarde Estate, Situation on, Case of Ward, etc., *July 26*, 1543–1547.
  Clare Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of, *July 17*, 16.
  Congested Districts Board—Appointment, etc., of Mr. Vereker, *July 23*, 685, 686.
  Congested Districts Commission
    Scope of, *July 18*, 212, 213; *July 25*, 1204.
    Sittings, Arrangements for, *July 25*, 1216.
  Constabulary
    Cryan, Constable, Offer made by, to pay Share of Damages in Carroll Case, *July 23*, 702.
    Dobson, Sergeant, Charge against, *July 25*, 1215, 1216.
  Cookstown—Alleged Improper Seizure of Pigs by Inspector Graham, *July 17*, 22.
  Coolgavney—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. M. Rinkle, *July 25*, 1183.
  Cooscrown Landing Place, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1048.
  Cork Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of, *July 18*, 211, 212.
  County, District and Municipal Councils
    Administrative Work of, Alleged Interference of Local Government Board, *July 26*, 1506–1516.
    Membership of, Removal of Disqualifications, proposed, *July 26*, 1513.
  Craughwell Horse Maiming Outrage—Police Efforts to Trace Offender, etc., *July 26*, 1415.
  Crimes and Outrages—Statistics to 30th June, 1906, *July 26*, 1547, 1548.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Croker Estate—Reinstatement Claim of M. Power, *July 25*, 1209, 1210.
- Cusack Estate Purchase Negotiations, Progress of, *July 23*, 692.
- Donegal Grand Jury, Alleged Exclusion of Catholics from, *July 26*, 1423.
- Douglas—Charge against Major O'Connor, Decision of Magistrates, etc., *July 23*, 688.
- Drumkeerin—Disturbances arising out of Boycott of C. Brady, *July 18*, 206.
- Drumkeerin and Dowra, Reason for Employment of Extra Police at, etc., *July 23*, 691.
- Dublin Corporation
  - Charges of Corruption Against—Inquiry proposed, *July 23*, 687.
  - Clerkships, procedure in Appointing to, *July 25*, 1211.
- Dunraven Estates, Sale of—Reinstatements Effected, etc., *July 23*, 685.
- Earlsfort Cattle Outrage—Police Efforts to Trace Offender, etc., *July 19*, 358.
- Education
  - Afflicted Children, proposals as to, *July 25*, 1218.
  - Commissioners, Names, etc., of, *July 23*, 701; *July 24*, 1023.
  - Inspectors
    - Notification of Visits of, *July 23*, 690.
    - Religion of, *July 23*, 702.
  - Intermediate—Royal Dublin Society Inquiry in 1897, Information as to, *July 18*, 178.
  - National School Teachers
    - Civil Rights, Amendment of Rules as to, *July 18*, 168.
    - Examinations — Classification of Passes, *July 23*, 689.
    - Extern Teachers, Rules as to, *July 18*, 210.
    - Security of Tenure—Memorial Received from Protestant Teachers' Union, *July 23*, 687.
  - Primary, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 19*, 408.
  - Rule 127 (B) Abolition of, proposed, *July 23*, 684.
  - School Building Grant, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1413.
  - "Two-Teacher" School, Definition of, *July 23*, 684; *July 24*, 1025.
- Ely Estate, Sale Proposals for, *July 26*, 1412.
- Evictions, Date of, Procedure in ascertaining, *July 26*, 1419.
- Export Trade, Returns as to, proposed, *July 24*, 1047.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Feagh National School—Case of Mr. R. I. McCurdy, *July 19*, 376.
- Fermanagh 12th July Celebrations, Breaches of the Peace at, etc., *July 26*, 1440.
- Finlay Estate—Area of P. McGovern's Holding, *July 25*, 1182.
- Fowney—Malicious outrages on property of Mr. R. Bailey, etc., *July 26*, 1425.
- Galway—Condition of County, *July 25*, 1212, 1213.
- Gascoigne Estate—Proposals as to Kilfinane Portion, *July 26*, 1416.
- Geevagh Sunday Band Practice, Alleged Police Interference with, *July 19*, 409.
- Gort Property of Lord Gough—Result of Negotiations, *July 26*, 1414.
- Gould Verschoyle Estate, Sale of—Price asked, etc., *July 23*, 692.
- Humble Estate, Sale of—Date of Inquiry into Claims of Evicted Tenants, etc., *July 19*, 363, 364.
- Improvement of landed Property Act, 1874, Loans issued under—Effect on Rents, etc., *July 25*, 1202.
- Irish Language — Teaching in Schools, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 408, 409.
- Johnstown Licensing Prosecution—Authority for Police Occupation of Schoolhouse, *July 24*, 1050.
- Kanturk.
  - Connell, Mrs. A., and J. Culhane, Reinstatement Claims of, *July 18*, 178.
  - Donovan, T., Reinstatement Claim of, *July 18*, 204, 205.
  - School—Reason for Resignation of Mr. J. P. O'Connor, *July 18*, 177.
- Kilkeasy—Tenants' Purchase Agreements for Church Temporalities owned by Land Commission, *July 18*, 210, 211.
- Kilkenny—Legislation to facilitate rebuilding of St. John's Bridge, proposed, *July 18*, 206.
- Kilmalloch Labourers' Cottages Scheme Expenses of, *July 18*, 207.
- Kingston Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 19*, 357.
- Kinvara Harbour Improvements, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1414.
- Labourers Cottages Act, Extension of, to Farmers' Servant men, proposed, *July 25*, 1201.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *con.*, *July 23*, 835, 840, 841, 842, 843, 847, 852, 853, 855, 856, 859, 860, 868, 878, 883, 889, 890, 893.
  - Arbitrators, Remuneration of, *July 18*, 208.

[*cont.*

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
  - Inquiries—Regulation as to Attendance of Medical Officers, *July 18*, 209.
  - Repayment of Loans—making Provisions retrospective, proposed, *July 18*, 207.
- Lambert Minors Estate
  - Police Visits to Tenants, Alleged, *July 19*, 376.
  - Sale of, *July 26*, 1424.
- Lamphiere Estate, Police on Special Duty at, *July 25*, 1209.
- Land Commission
  - Postcard, Alleged Unauthorised use of, *July 18*, 208.
  - Wilkinson, Mr., Duties, etc., of, *July 18*, 204.
- Land Purchase—Bank Receipts, Procedure in giving, *July 23*, 704.
- Limerick Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 18*, 212.
- Lismore Salmon Weir—Regulations as to Closing Dummy Hatches, *July 17*, 23.
- Lloyd Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. Reilly, *July 23*, 691.
- Local Government Board
  - Auditors and Inspectors, Qualifications of, and Method of Appointing, *July 26*, 1508.
  - Constitution and Work of, *July 26*, 1506–1509.
  - Officials—Information Supplied in Return, *July 25*, 1213–1215.
  - Report for 1905, Date of Issuing, *July 23*, 694.
  - Surcharges on Accounts of Local Bodies, Method of Dealing with, *July 26*, 1510–1512.
- Longford
  - Land Purchase in, *July 25*, 1206.
  - Magistracy, Religion of, *July 24*, 1050.
  - March Assizes—Case of J. M'Cann, *July 24*, 1046.
- Loughrea—Police, Alleged Attack on, by Emergency Man Niland, *July 26*, 1414.
- Lowe Estate, Sale of, *July 26*, 1416.
- Lucan Estate—Disposal of Pontoon Portion, *July 26*, 1442.
- Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Protests received against, *July 25*, 1200.
- Maconely Estate—Turbary Rights of Tenants, *July 25*, 1207, 1208.
- Magistrates
  - Appointments (1902–1906), *July 18*, 203.
  - O'Malley, Mr. P. J., Complaints made against, *July 26*, 1413.
  - Malone Estate, Sale of—Disposal of Lands, etc., *July 18*, 201; *July 25*, 1204, 1205.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Minshun (Freud) Estate, Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *July 26*, 1417.
- Monaghan Asylum—Alleged Wrongful Detention of F. McDonald, *July 26*, 1420.
- Morrogh Bernard Estate, Sale Negotiations, Progress made with, *July 18*, 168.
- Mountshannon Estate, Purchase of—Reinstatements Effected, etc., *July 26*, 1417.
- Moymore—Alleged Outrage against P. Casey, *July 25*, 1182.
- Owenmore River, Drainage proposals, *July 19*, 407.
- Parker Estate—Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *July 19*, 365.
- Poor Law.
  - Children, Boarding-out System for, *July 26*, 1515.
  - Commission Report, Date of Issuing, *July 23*, 693; *July 24*, 1048, 1049.
  - Medical Officers—New Rule as to Proficiency in Vaccination, *July 18*, 213.
- Portarlington Police Force, Strength of, *July 17*, 38; *July 24*, 1049.
- Prisons—Appointments of Majors Lewis and Luscombe, and Mr. Boland, *July 26*, 1418.
- Queen's County
  - Crimelessness of—Revocation of Proclamation, proposed, *July 25*, 1198.
  - Special Court—Case of J. Starkie, *July 25*, 1199, 1200.
- Questions—Posting Copies of Replies proposed, *July 25*, 1210, 1211.
- Reenard Pier Improvements, Decision as to, *July 25*, 1181.
- Richmond District Lunatic Asylum Accounts, Dispute as to, *July 26*, 1513, 1514.
- Roscrea
  - Inquiry into Sanitation of, proposed, *July 25*, 1206.
  - Union Water Supply, Proposals for Improvement of, *July 25*, 1205.
- Royal Canal, Condition of—Appointment made on Board of Control, etc., *July 18*, 200.
- Royal Commissions, Constitution of, *July 26*, 1542, 1543.
- Ryfield—Allegation against Mr. T. Rorke, J.P., by Mr. J. Dowd, *July 25*, 1212.
- Sands, Mrs., Estate of—Reinstatement claim of J. Houlihan, *July 18*, 202, 203.
- Sankey Estate—Reinstatement claim of Mr. P. McTaggart, *July 23*, 690.
- Shannon Development Company, Grant to, *July 25*, 1205.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Shimla River Fishing Regulations, Enforcement of, *July 18*, 214.
- Somers Estate—Sale of farm to Mr. Tracey, *July 24*, 1024.
- Southwell Estate Evicted Tenants, Inquiries into cases of, *July 25*, 1216.
- Stoney Estate Grazing Lands, Disposal of, *July 19*, 359, 361, 362.
- Thompson (Clonfin) Estate Sale Negotiations, Progress of, *July 23*, 693.
- Todd-Thornton Estate—Sale of Mullinune Meadows, *July 26*, 1424.
- Toomebridge Petty Sessions Clerk, Avocations of, *July 26*, 1442.
- Ulster 12th July Celebrations, Breaches of the Peace during, *July 23*, 695.
- Unemployed Grant of £200,000—Sum allocated to Ireland, *July 23*, 694.
- Vagrancy, Proposals as to dealing with, *July 26*, 1515.
- Woodroffe Estate untenanted land, Disposal of, *July 19*, 365.

Buckhaven, Methil and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *July 17*, 2.
- *c.* 1R.* *July 17*, 14.
  - 2R.* *July 25*, 1177.

Buenos Ayres Grand National Tramways Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Bulgaria
- Sofia—Decision as to Establishment of Bank, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Baker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 17*, 32.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com' July 18*, 226; *Con. July 25*, 1285.

Burghclere, Lord
- Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of — Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26*, 1390–1392.

Burmah
- Opium Trade, *see that title.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
- Agricultural Rates Act, Basis of Payments under, *July 26*, 1431.
- Anthrax, Deaths from—Dealing with Dangerous Wool at Port of Entry, proposed, *July 24*, 1041.
- Bills, Private—Return as to Metropolitan Borough Councils Expenses, proposed, *July 26*, 1432.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Byker Overseer Ships—Appointment of Mr. Nixon, *July 24*, 1021.
- Chester-le-Street — Vaccination Prosecution case of Mr. Dixon, *July 17*, 33.
- Education Rate, Applications received for consent of Board to raise (1903–5), *July 18*, 180.
- Hollesley Bay Labour Colony—Results of Experiment and Proposals as to continuance, *July 19*, 424, 461, 462.
- Inebriates Act, 1898—Application to Pauper Lunatics suffering from effects of Alcohol, proposed, *July 23*, 701.
- Kinder Reservoir Works, Reason for stoppage of, *July 19*, 402.
- Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to—Effect on Unemployment, etc., *July 19*, 428.
- Marlborough, Death of man from Meningitis near—Action of Police and Poor Law Officials, etc., *July 19*, 400.
- Motor Omnibuses
  - Extra Emergency Brake for, proposed, *July 18*, 196.
  - Powers of Local Government Board as to control, etc., *July 17*, 20.
  - Speed Limit in Metropolitan area, *July 18*, 180; *July 23*, 730.
- Ockenden Labour Colony, Results of Experiment and Proposals as to continuance, *July 19*, 424, 461.
- Poor Law
  - Children
    - Boarding out of, Revision of Regulation as to, proposed, *July 19*, 464.
    - Cost of maintenance under various systems, *July 24*, 1042.
  - Commission Report and Recommendations, Date of presenting, *July 19*, 434.
  - Relieving Officers, Reason for objecting to Women as, *July 19*, 372.
- Stansted Tuberculosis Experimental Farm, Expenditure on and Work done by, etc., *July 26*, 1432, 1463.
- Toxteth Poor Law Relieving Officer, Appointment of, *July 26*, 1464.
- Unemployed
  - Afforestation as a Solution of the Problem, *July 19*, 460, 461.
  - Distress Committees, Conditions of obtaining Work from, *July 24*, 1043.
  - Dock, Casual and unskilled Labour, Proposals for dealing with, *July 19*, 428, 429, 460.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Unemployed—*cont.*
  - Grant for, from Consolidated Fund, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 427, 428, 461.
    - Sum allocated to Ireland, *July 24*, 1042.
  - Relief Works, Objections to, *July 19*, 425.
  - Skilled Labourers temporarily out of Employment, Necessity for dealing with, *July 19*, 431, 432.
  - Statistics as to, *July 19*, 463.
  - "Unemployable" Class, Suggestions for dealing with, *July 19*, 423, 424.
  - Women—Statistics as to, *July 19*, 420, 462.
- Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905
  - Administration of — Working of Distress Committees, Number of Applicants, Number Relieved, etc., *July 19*, 419–429.
  - Amendment of—Government Proposals as to, *July 19*, 419, 426, 427.
  - Cost of Operations, Sources from which Money was drawn, etc., *July 19*, 422, 423.
  - Defects in, and alleged Failure of, *July 19*, 425, 426, 462.
- Vaccination — Exemption Certificates granted in 1904, and 1905, *July 26*, 1432.
- Vagrancy Committee Recommendations, Proposals for adopting, *July 19*, 373, 424, 425.
- Water Supply and Afforestation, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 25*, 1194, 1195.
- West Ham Workhouse Infant School, Overcrowding in, *July 19*, 399.
- Westbourne Park Chapel, Assessment of, *July 25*, 1195.
- Withington Workhouse, Alleged Defects in Administration of, *July 19*, 401.

Bury Corporation Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Business of the House
- Bills, *see that title.*
- Course of.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. Redmond, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Weir, Mr. W. Redmond, *July 24*, 1056, 1057.
- Saturday Sitting, Proposals as to.
  - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1029.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 803; *July 24*, 1091, 1092, 1118.

Bute (English and Welsh Estates) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 23*, 671.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
- Ardara Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 18*, 181.
- Belfast
  - Postmen—Holiday on 12 July, proposed, *July 26*, 1411, 1436.
  - Mail Van Drivers, Conditions of Service of, *July 26*, 1436.
  - Promotions in, *July 26*, 1436.
- Blind Persons, Postage on Literature for, *July 18*, 196.
- Bristol Post Office—Duties of Messrs. Bicknell & Setter, *July 24*, 1016.
- Cavan Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed, *July 25*, 1218.
- Curaheen Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *July 23*, 699.
- Drumlish Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *July 24*, 1053.
- Glasgow Postmen, Allowances to, *July 25*, 1184.
- Gortregan Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 26*, 1473.
- Halfpenny Post—Returning Business Documents Free of Charge if not Delivered, proposed, *July 19*, 403.
- Hampstead and Victoria, Telephone Connection between, *July 26*, 1412.
- Lisnalong Postmaster—Alleged Attendance at Orange Society Meeting, *July 26*, 1435.
- Liverpool Telegraph Office
  - Press Messages, Alleged Delay in, *July 26*, 1466.
  - Promotions in, *July 26*, 1466, 1467.
- Magherafelt Postman, Connection of, with Orange Processions, etc., *July, 26*, 1436.
- Mail Bag Cloth, Contract for, *July 19*, 403.
- MailService—Peninsular and Oriental Company, Apportionment of Subsidy paid to, *July 17*, 18.
- Monaghan Post Office Site, Progress made with Purchase of, *July 18*, 181.
- Norwich—Alleged Delay in Telegraphic Transmission from London, of Report of Mr. Haldane's Speech, *July 23*, 677.
- Penny Post, Universal—German Attitude towards Question, *July 17*, 17.
- Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill, *Com.*, *July 25*, 1365.
- Post Office Sites Bill, 3R., *July 17*, 144.
- Postage Stamps, Facilities for Buying, at Railway Stations, *July 18*, 197.

[*cont.*

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*

Postmasters, Sub—Holiday Regulations, *July 25*, 1181.

Postmen—Civil Rights, in regard to County Council Elections, *July 23*, 676.

Preston Post-office Staff, Proposals for Revision of, *July 17*, 34.

Rathkeale Post Office Premises, *July 23*, 734; *July 25*, 1219.

Retirement, Age for, *July 18*, 167.

Richmond (Surrey) Post Office—Proposal as to further Revision of Duties, *July 17*, 18.

Salcombe Telegraph Service, Decision as to, *July 19*, 403.

Savings Bank Unclaimed Balances—List of Depositors, proposed, *July 24*, 1016.

Sorters—Promotion System in South Western District Office, *July 19*, 402.

Telegraph Service

- Figures, Regulations as to Transmitting, *July 26*, 1435.
- Staff Required, Basis of Calculating, *July 26*, 1465, 1466.

Telephone Service

- Private Wires over Long Distances, Charge for, *July 24*, 1018.
- Sunday Duty and Overtime of Women Operators in London Department, *July 23*, 676.

Thurso District Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 23*, 698.

Tinahely Post Office Medical Officer—Appointment of Dr. Bolster, *July 24*, 1053, 1054.

Volunteer Camp Training, Leave of Postal Employees, *July 18*, 197.

Byker

Overseerships—Appointment of Mr. Nixon.
Q. Mr. Condon; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 24*, 1021.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N]

Devonshire Street Council School, Salford—Decision as to Charging Fees, *July 19*, 371.

Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 502, 503.

Natal—Native Rising

- Arms of both Combatants, *July 19*; 387, 388.
- Military Operations, Conduct of—British Government Representations proposed, *July 23*, 714.

Transvaal—Names Enrolled in Rand Voter's Register, *July 19*, 586.

Cabinet Ministers

Traffic, Passes for, Authority for Issue of, etc.

- *Qs.* Sir F. Banbury, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 725, 726.
- *Qs.* Viscount Turnour, Mr. Liddell, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1462, 1463.

Caldbeck Estate

Ballacolla, proposals as to Sale of
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 703.

Caledonian Canal

Report Presented, *July 19*, 354.

Cambrian Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin University]

Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 845, 851, 854, 857–860, 867, 869–871.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]

Africa, South—Self-Government Proposals.

- Commission Report, Date of Tabling, *July 23*, 734, 735.
- Opportunity for Discussing, etc., *July 17*, 39, 40.

Army

- Estimates, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 19*, 413.
- Re-organisation proposals, opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, *July 19*, 480.

Australian Local Naval Force, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 215, 216.

Business of the House, Course of, *July 24*, 1029, 1056, 1057.

Crofters' Acts Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 200; *July 23*, 736; *July 26*, 1475, 1476.

Education—Pupil Teachers in Scotland, Opportunity for Discussing New Regulations, *July 26*, 1478.

Egypt—Attack on British Officers—Opportunity for Discussion of Papers, etc., *July 23*, 737.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 26*, 1476.

Deanery of Manchester Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 500, 501.

Defence of the Empire—Committee of Defence

- Constitution of, *July 23*, 736.
- Vote, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 18*, 217

India—Partition of Bengal, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 26*, 1477.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
- Irish Estimates, Time allotted to, *July 23*, 740.
- Midwives Act, 1902—Restrictions on Irish Midwives Practising in England, etc., *July 24*, 1028.
- Musical Copyright Bill—Proposals as to Third Reading, *July 23*, 739.
- Natal, Native Rising
  - Imperial Government Intervention, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 413, 414.
  - Prisoners, Alleged Killing of, by Native Levies, *July 18*, 191, 192.
- Naval Bases, Defence of—Transfer to Admiralty, etc., *July 26*, 1477,
- North Sea Scientific Investigations, Progress made with, *July 25*, 1220.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 19*, 412.
- Public Trustee Bill, Proposals as to taking, *July 26*, 1478.
- Royal Commissions
  - Irish, Constitution of, *July 23*, 739.
  - Statistics as to, *July 18*, 216.
- Russian Duma, British Government Policy as to—Speech of Prime Minister, *July 25*, 1220.
- Scottish Estimates, proposals as to, *July 23*, 738.
- Sheriffs, High, Procedure in Nominating, *July 24*, 1055.
- Street Traffic Commission Report—Proposals for adopting Recommendations, *July 23*, 737.
- Tobacco (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 736.
- Transvaal Chinese Labourers, Crimes of—Proposals for Protection of White People, *July 19*, 411.
- Trawlers Certificates Suspension Bill, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 411, 412; *July* 23, 738.
- Unemployed Grant—Sum allocated to Scotland, *July 24*, 1028.
- Wages Board Bill, Facilities for taking, *July 26*, 1476.
- Welsh Church Disestablishment — Proposals as to Legislative Measures, *July 24*, 1055.

Camperdown, Earl of
- Tobacco growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 11, 12.

Canals
- Royal Commission, Constitution of—Irish Representation, etc.
  Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1472.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
- Religious Instruction in Council Schools Character of — Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26*, 1373–1386, 1406.

Cardiff Gas Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Cardiff Railway Bill
- *c. Con.* July 19*, 352.
  3R.* *July 23*, 670.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 24*, 897

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Herts, St. Albans]
- Africa, South, Garrison in—Proposals as to replacing Disbanded Regiments, *July 18*, 176.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 813–816.

Carnarvon Castle
- Restoration, proposals as to.
  Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 19*, 375.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*
- Alkali, etc., Works Bill, 3R., *July 23*, 649.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 65–68, 116, 117; *July 18*, 296; *Con.*, *July 25*, 1298.
- Extradition Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 530.
- Irish Estimates, Allocation of time for, *July 19*, 416.
- Law Courts, Ireland—Cases tried in King's Bench Division, *July 26*, 1474.
- Marriage with Foreigners Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 525, 526, 527, 528.
- Parliamentary Procedure — Adjournment of the House, proposed, *July 19*, 539.
- Saccharine Law, assimilating to that relating to Sugar, proposed, *July 18*, 323.

Castlereagh, Lord [Maidstone]
- Army
  - *Personnel*—Reduction, proposals as to, *July 19*, 474.
  - Reorganisation proposals
    - Army Council, Opinion of, *July 19*, 472.
    - Opportunity for adequate Discussion of, *July 19*, 472–474,
  - Short Tour, Battalions serving on *July 18*, 173.
- Army and Militia Recruiting Statistics for 1904, *July 17*, 25.

Castlereagh, Lord—*cont.*
Defence of the Empire—Expansion outside Limits of Regular Forces, Necessity for, *July 19*, 473.
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1156.
Indian Army Drafts in 1904 and 1905, *July 18*, 172.

Cavan
Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstating.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1200, 1201.
Magistracy, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1203.
Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 25*, 1218.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Education Rate, Applications received for consent of Board to raise (1903–5) *July 18*, 180.
Marine Insurance Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1557, 1559.

Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W. [Derbyshire, W.]
Parliamentary Procedure—Date of beginning Autumn Session, *July 20*, 640.
Civil Service Examiners serving under Board of Education, Power to transfer, *July 24*, 1044.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 231, 286, 288; *Con.*, *July 24*, 1102, 1134.
Income Tax, Commissioners—Extra Work, Proposals as to Additional Pay for, *July 18*, 326.

Cawdor, Earl
Motor Omnibuses—Noise, Annoyance, and Injury in London, Measures in Mitigation of, *July 20*, 552, 553.

Cawley, Mr. F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
Manchuria—Protection of British Trade Interests, Date of Opening Port of Dalny, etc., *July 19*, 393.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Bills, Private—Number of Reports of Board of Trade Furnished to Unopposed Bill Committee, *July 19*, 399.
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1155, 1158.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 72–74, 116; *July 18*, 286; *Con.*, *July 23*, 741–744, 763–766; *July 24*, 1060, 1062, 1087–1089, 1101, 1116, 1117; *July 25*, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1297.
Amendments to Clauses 2 and 4, proposals as to, *July 23*, 733.

Cecil, Lord R.—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Section 37, Subsection (8) Order in Council under—Means of Preventing from coming into Force, *July 23*, 733.
Inebriates Act, 1898—Application to Pauper Lunatics Suffering from Effects of Alcohol, proposed, *July 23*, 700.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
Africa, South—Self-Government Proposals Commission, Cost of and date of Presenting Report, *July 23*, 720.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 757, 758; *July 24*, 1097–1099, 1102, 1132, 1133; *July 25*, 1251–1254, 1283–1285.

Ceylon
Financial Condition
Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 1190.
Import Duty on Indian Tea, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 709.
Pearl Fisheries—Machine for Extracting Pearls, Cost of and Results Achieved by,
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 711, 712.
Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1034.
Trade Statistics and Industrial Condition
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 1189.

Chairman
Education (England and Wales) Bill
Amendment proposed to be amended should be Withdrawn and Reintroduced as Amended, *July 17*, 78.
Amendments in Order, *July 17*, 86.
Minister for Wales, Power to Provide Salary for, *July 17*, 81.
Withdrawal of Amendment being Objected to, the Question must be put, *July 18*, 288, 289.
Future Legislation could not be discussed on the Estimates in Committee, *July 19*, 419.
Progress, Motion to Report, *July 19*, 531.
Public Trustee Bill—Liabilities incurred by Public Trustees, Defraying out of Consolidated Fund, *July 18*, 335.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Channel Ferry Railway and Quay Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Channel Islands
Merchant Shipping Laws Extension, proposals as to.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17*, 33.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 253, 254, 273, 279-281.
Great Eastern Railway Company—Alleged Disregard of Acts as to Private Sidings, *July 19*, 374.

Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee on Law, *July 19*, 418.
Con. and 3R.* *July 24*, 1176.
l. 1R.* *July 26*, 1370.

Charities
(*For particular places see their Names.*)
Schemes for Administering, Procedure in Framing.
Q. Mr. Silcock; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 17*, 36.

Chearnley, Major, Estate of
Kearne, J., Reinstatement Claim of.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 689.

Cheetham, Mr. J. F. [Stalybridge]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 285, 293, 295.

Cheltenham Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1170.
Infectious Disease (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 1176.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 845, 849, 863, 871, 885, 886, 887, 888.
Land Purchase-Price—Valuation Standard, Decision in Blake-Forster Case, etc., *July 18*, 170.
Magistrates, Fees on Appointment of, *July 25*, 1217, 1218.

Chester le-Street
Vaccination Prosecution, Case of Mr. Dixon, etc.
Q. Mr. J. W. Taylor; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 17*, 33.
Q. Mr. J. W. Taylor; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1457.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. J. Bryce.
Salary of—Vote for, *July 26*, 1521.

Children
Employment of
London By-laws, Date of Sanctioning.
Q. Mr. H. J. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 676.
Poor Law, *see that title.*

China
Anhui Mining Final Contract, Enforcing Terms of, etc.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 26*, 1454.
Opium Trade, *see that title.*
Trade Mark Law, Date of bringing into Operation, etc.
Q. Mr. Tillett; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 26*, 1427, 1428.

Chiozza-Money, Mr. L. G. [Paddington, N.]
Fish-Curing Industry, Scottish, Sanitary Supervision of, *July 26*, 1459.
Florists' Assistants, Hours of, *July 26*, 1460.
Transvaal
Chinese Labourers, Corporal Punishment of—Name of Coolie No. 277, *July 17*, 30.
Gold Mines, Probable Duration of, *July 26*, 1450.
Wages Board Bill, Facilities for taking, *July 26*, 1476.
Westbourne Park Chapel, Assessment of, *July 25*, 1195.

Church Discipline (No. 2) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 19*, 418.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N.W.]
Africa, East—British Coinage, Use of, proposed, *July 24*, 1035.
Africa, South
British Indian Rights—Definition of Native, *July 23*, 715, 719.
Milk, Skimmed, Import Duty on, *July 23*, 710.
Self-Government Commission, Cost of and Date of Presenting Report, *July 23*, 720.
Africa, West, Freight Rates to, *July 26*, 1452.
Brunei, Position of Affairs in, *July 26*, 1454, 1455.
Ceylon
Import Duty on Indian Tea, Decision as to, *July 23*, 709.
Pearl Fisheries—Machine for Extracting Pearls, Cost of and Results achieved by, *July 23*, 712; *July 24*, 1034.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Malta
  - Funeral Processions, Regulations as to Chaplains attending, *July 26*, 1446.
  - Services and Processions, Regulations as to — Correspondence with Governor, etc., *July 19*, 384–386; *July 23*, 717.
- Midwives Act, 1902—Restrictions on Irish Midwives practising in the Colonies, *July 24*, 1018.
- Natal
  - Municipal Corporations Bill, Provisions of—Effect on *Status* of British Indians, etc., *July 26*, 1428, 1429.
  - Native Rising
    - Arms used by both Combatants, *July 19*, 387, 388.
    - Bambaata, Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of—Charges against Major Platt, etc., *July 18*, 189, 190; *July 26*, 1449.
    - Bishop of Zululand's Allegations against Colonel Royston's Column, *July 23*, 719; *July 26*, 1447.
    - Kula, Circumstances of Arrest of, *July 19*, 389, 390.
    - Military Operations, Conduct of British Government Representations, proposed, *July 23*, 714.
      - Inquiry into, proposed, *July 23*, 721.
      - Responsibility for, *July 26*, 1453.
    - Natives killed, wounded and Prisoners, *July 18*, 186, 187, 189; *July 19*, 390; *July 26*, 1449.
    - Prisoners, Alleged killing of, by Native Levies, *July 18*. 187, 189.
- Nigeria
  - Chief Nana, Return of, *July 26*, 1448.
  - Cotton Cultivation, Labour available for, *July 17*, 29.
  - Railway Construction, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 28.
- Opium Revenue Farming System, Restrictions on, in Straits Settlements, etc., *July 19*, 389.
- Rhodesia—Gwelo Diamond Area, Powers of Chartered Company to Prohibit Prospecting in, *July 23*, 710.
- Singapore Docks—Tanjong Pagar Dock Company Shares, purchased by Federated Malay States, *July 18*, 179.
- South African War
  - Chiveibach, Dr., Decision as to Claim of, *July 23*, 711.
  - Claims—Re-opening Question, proposed, *July 26*, 1450, 1451.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Straits Settlements—Income derived from licensing Gambling Houses, etc., *July 26*, 1447.
- Transvaal
  - Bewaarplatzen, Disposal of, *July 26*, 718.
  - Chinese Labour
    - Amusements, Government Support for Provision of, *July 19*, 390.
    - Corporal Punishment — Cason Mine Case, Investigation of, *July 17*, 30, 31.
    - Criminals Repatriated, *July 23*, 720.
    - Desertions during May and June, *July 23*, 717.
    - Murders by, during first six months of 1906, *July 23*, 717.
    - Repatriation
      - Amended Notification, Date of posting up, *July 23*, 716.
      - Petition of Miners against, *July 23*, 713.
      - Superintendent of Foreign Labour, Duties of, *July 26*, 1445.
  - Franchise, Persons excluded from, *July 23*, 716.
  - Gambling, Crime due to—Amendment of Ordinance, proposed, *July 24*, 1036.
  - Gold Mines, Probable Duration of, *July 26*, 1450.
  - Native Labour
    - Central African Natives — Mortality Returns (1905–6), *July 23*, 718.
    - Kaffir Recruiting Licences, Delay in Issue of, *July 17*, 31.
  - Rand Voters' Register, Names enrolled in, *July 19*, 387.
  - White Labour in Mines—Report on Experiments, proposed, *July 24*, 1036.
- Trinidad
  - Borough Council—Decision as to Use of Elective Principle, *July 24*, 1036.
  - Financial Condition—Estimates for Current Year, etc., *July 24*, 1037.
  - Legislative Council, Alleged Unrepresentative System in, *July 24*, 1035.
- Uganda—
  - Reports as to Native Unrest, *July 23*, 714.
  - Sleeping Sickness—Removal of Seat of Government to Kampala, proposed, *July 26*, 1452.
- Zanzibar—Decision as to Abolition of Slavery on Mainland, *July 26*, 1448.

Civil Service
Assistant Clerks, New Class, Salaries of.
Q. Mr. Snowden ; A. Mr. McKenna, *July 18,* 183.
Examiners serving under Board of Education, Power to Transfer
Q. Mr. V. Cavendish ; A. Mr. Lough *July 24,* 1044.
Second Division Clerks desirous of Transfer, List of, proposed
Q. Mr. Field ; A. Mr. McKenna, *July 24,* 1019, 1020.

Civil Service Estimates
Ireland
Local Government Board, Salaries and Expenses—£38,566, *Com., July 26,* 1479.
Offices of Chief Secretary, and of Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums—£14,118, *Com., July 26,* 1521.
Local Government Board, Salaries and Expenses—£147,470, *Com., July* 19, 419.
Supplementary—Estimate Presented, *July* 19, 354.

Clacton Urban District Council Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 534.

Clanmorris Estate
Sale of—Charges against Messrs. Good & Black, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell ; A. Mr. Bryce, *July 19,* 362.

Clanricarde Estate
Situation on, Case of Ward, etc.—Allegations against Lord Clanricarde.
Os. Colonel Saunderson, *July 26,* 1526–1533 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1534 ; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1539, 1540 ; Mr. Bryce, 1543–1547.
Ward, Mr. M., House of—Alleged Attack on Policeman by Emergency Man Niland
Q. Mr. Duffy ; A. Mr. Bryce, *July 26,* 1414.

Clare
Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of
Q. Mr. Halpin ; A. Mr. Bryce, *July 17,* 16.

Claremorris
Light Railway—*see under* Ballinrobe.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]
Bills, Private—Return as to Metropolitan Borough Councils' Expenses, proposed, *July 26,* 1432.

Clonbrock, Lord
Congested Districts—Ireland
Commission of Inquiry
Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc., *July 23,* 653–657.
Scope of, *July 23,* 649.
Compulsory Acquisition of Land by the Board, Objections to, *July 23* 651, 652.
Cottage Industries, Encouragement of, *July 23,* 653.
Grass Lands, Disposal of, *July 23,* 652.

Coal Mines
Inspection of Welsh Mines—Duties of Mr. Atkinson, etc.
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17,* 32, 33 ; *July 19,* 396.

Coates, Maj. E. F. [Lewisham]
Vaccination Exemption Certificates Granted in 1904 and 1905, *July 26,* 1431.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]
Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con., July 24,* 1144–1146.
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill—Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17,* 138.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges, Effect of, on Private Firms, *July 23,* 706.

Cockermouth
Parliamentary Election—New Writ Issued, *July 23,* 740.

Cogan, Mr. D. J. [Wicklow, E.]
Local Government Board
County, District and Municipal Councils Administrative Work, Interference with, *July 26,* 1496–1498.
Public Bodies Order—Opposition of Local Authorities to, *July 26,* 1495.
Lunatic Soldiers, etc., in District Asylums, Deductions from Pensions of, *July 17,* 38.
Richmond District Lunatic Asylum Accounts—Dispute with Local Government Board, *July 26,* 1495-1497, 1514.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Channel Islands, Extension of Merchant Shipping Laws to, *July 17,* 33.

Colombia
Trade Report Presented, *July 23,* 643.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. W. Churchill.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*See also names of Colonies, etc.*]

Commerce
See Trade and Commerce.

Companies Act
Returns, Penalties for not Filing, etc.
Qs. Mr. Barran; *As.* Mr. Kearley, *July 25*, 1193, 1194.

Compulsory Military Service
Possibility of Introducing, Cost, etc.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 24*, 927; Lord Tweedmouth, 967, 968.

Condon, Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]
Byker Overseerships—Appointment of Mr. Nixon, *July 24*, 1021.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Commission of Inquiry into Congested Districts, *see under* Ireland—Congested Districts.
Vereker, Mr., Appointment of—Qualifications and previous Occupation, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 685, 686.

Congo Free State
Stannard, Mr.—Result of Trial, etc.
Qs. Mr. Alden; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 392; *July 24*, 1038, 1039.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also names of places.*]
Cryan, Constable, offer made by, to pay Share of Damages in Carroll Case.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 702, 703.
Dobson, Sergeant G., Charge against.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1215, 1216.

Conveyancing Bill
c. 1R., *July 25*, 1221.

Cookstown
Pigs seized by Inspector Graham—Result of Test for Tuberculosis, etc.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 17*, 22.

Coolgavney
Reinstatement claim of Mrs. M. Rinkle.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1182, 1183.

Cooper, Dr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Lunacy
Asylums, Architect employed for altering and designing, etc., *July 26*, 1460, 1461.
Commissioners, Increase in Number of, proposed, *July 26*, 1459.
Post Office Sorters—Promotion System in South Western District Office, *July 19*, 402.

Cooscroum
Landing Place, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1048.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Cabinet Ministers, Traffic Passes of, *July 26*, 1463.
Education — National School Teachers' Security of Tenure, Memorial received from Protestant Teachers' Union, *July 23*, 687.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 836, 879, 881, 888.
Malta
Funeral Processions, Regulations as to Chaplains attending, *July 26*, 1446.
Protestant Mission Services, Reason for Prohibiting—Date of Tabling Correspondence, etc., *July 19*, 385, 386; *July 23*, 716, 717.
Questions Irish—Posting Copies of Replies, proposed, *July 25*, 1210.
Roscrea, Inquiry into Sanitation of, proposed, *July 25*, 1206.
Unemployed—Grant of £200,000—Sum allocated to Ireland, *July 23*, 694.
Yeomanry in the North of Ireland, Services of, *July 25*, 1186.

Cork
Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of.
Qs. Mr. Flynn, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 211, 212.
Queen's College Report (1905–6) Presented, *July 18*, 162; *July 19*, 343.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 342.
3R.* *July 24*, 897.

Cornwall
Parliamentary Division of Bodmin—New Member sworn, *July 26*, 1479.

Cornwall, Sir E. A. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 825–828.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
- Army, Increase in Strength of, *July 20*, 630, 631.
- Assam—Circumstances of Execution of Udoya Patni, *July 17*, 25.
- India
  - Army
    - Expenditure, Increase in, *July 20*, 628.
    - Reorganisation Scheme of Lord Kitchener, Cost of, etc., *July 20*, 630, 631.
    - Strength of—Standard of, Variation of since time of the Mutiny, *July 20*, 628–630.
  - Bengal Newspapers, Measures taken to ascertain Names of Subscribers, *July 26*, 1439.
  - Central Provinces, Representation of, on Legislative Council, *July 23*, 681.
  - Legislative Councils Reform Committee, Constitution of, *July 26*, 1443.
- Natal—Municipal Corporations Bill, Provisions of, Effect on *status* of British Indians, etc., *July 26*, 1428, 1429.
- Opium Trade with China, Proposals for Reform of, *July 17*, 27.
- Soudan—Spirituous Liquors, Statistics as to Importation of, *July 23*, 697.
- Tibet Agreement—Date of Tabling Papers, *July 18*, 171.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill
- c. *Con.* July 19*, 352.
  Rep. July 24*, 1013.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
- Ceylon—Trade Statistics, Financial and Industrial Condition, etc., *July 25*, 1189, 1190.
- Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1159.
- Indian Civil Service—Authorising Payment of Privilege Leave Pay in England, proposed, *July 20*, 569.

Courtney of Penwith, Baron
- Introduced to House of Lords, *July 19*, 341.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
- Africa, South—Rights of British Indians, *July 19*, 382 ; *July 23*, 715, 719.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1062–1064.
- Transvaal—Franchise, Persons excluded from, *July 23*, 716.
- Unemployed
  - Grant from Consolidated Fund, proposals as to, *July 19*, 454, 455.
  - Relief Works, Objections to, *July 19*, 455.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
- Ballykinlar Camp, Damage done to Roads in Vicinity of, *July 25*, 1183.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 845.
- Land Purchase—Bank Receipts, Procedure in giving, *July 23*, 703.
- Limerick Summer Assizes—Authority for Military Guard of Honour, *July 26*, 1443.
- Ulster 12th July Celebrations, Breaches of the Peace during, *July 23*, 694.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
- Earlsfort Cattle Outrage—Police Efforts to trace Offender, etc., *July 19*, 358.
- Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1150.
- Infectious Disease (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 1176.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 838, 861, 878, 887.
- Unemployed Grant—Sum allocated to Ireland, *July 24*, 1042.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
- Education Code—Subjects Dealt with in Explanatory Memorandum, *July 25*, 1195, 1196.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 74–76 ; *July 18*, 220 ; *Con.*, *July 23*, 777 ; *July 24*, 1066–1068, 1131 ; *July 25*, 1293–1296, 1305.

Craughwell
- Horse Maiming Outrage—Police Efforts to trace Offender, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Duffy ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1415.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]
- Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1160, 1168.
- Douglas—Charges against Major O'Connor, Decision of Magistrates, etc., *July 23*, 688.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 854, 890.
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 504, 514, 521.
- Prisons—Majors Lewis and Luscombe and Mr. Boland, Appointments of, *July 26*, 1418.

Crediton Gas Bill
- c. *Rep.* July 17*, 14.
  Con. July 23*, 671.
  3R.* *July 26*, 1408.

Crellin's Patents Bill
- l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council*
Congested Districts, Ireland
Commission of Inquiry
Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested District Board, etc., *July 23*, 664–666.
Scope of, *July 23*, 665.
Grass Lands, Disposal of, *July 23*, 667.
Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill, Commons Amend. *Con.*, *July 20*, 538.
Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of—Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26*, 1396–1406.
Tobacco, Cultivation in Ireland
Special Facilities and Fiscal Remissions granted by Government for Encouragement of, *July 17*, 8, 11.

Crimean War
Loughlin, T. Pension Claim of,
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 696, 697.

Crimes and Criminal Offences
Returns, Omission of Names of Acquitted Persons from, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 194.
Sentences of Imprisonment on Males over Twenty-one passed during last Twelve months.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 699.

Crimes and Outrages, Ireland
Statistics to 30 June, 1906.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1547, 1548.

Criminal Appeal Bill
c. 1R.* *July 18*, 217.

Crofters Acts Amendment Bill
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 200.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 736.
Qs. Mr. Morton, Mr. Weir; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 1475, 1476.

Croker Estate
Reinstatement Claim of Mr. Power, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Lundon, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1209-1210.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Unemployed
Dock, Casual and Unskilled Labour, Proposals for dealing with, *July 19*, 442.
Skilled Labourers temporarily out of Employment, necessity for dealing with, *July 19*, 442–444.
"Unemployable" class, Suggestions for dealing with, *July 19*, 442, 443.
Unemployed Workmen Act ,1905.
Administration of—Working Distress Committees, number of Applicants, Number Relieved, etc., *July 19*, 441.
Defects in, and alleged Failure of, *July 19*, 440, 441.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges (1903–1906), *July 23*, 680.

Crown Lands
Recovery of Crown Rents—*Resolution* [Mr. McKenna] Reported, *July 17*, 141.

Crown Lands (Re-committed) Bill
c. *Com.** *July 24*, 1176.
3R. *July 25*, 1367.
l. 1R.* *July 26*, 1370.

Crumlin
Railway Level Crossing, Danger of—Construction of Bridge, proposed.
Q. Colonel Herbert; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 729.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Local Government Board, Administrative work of, *July 26*, 1504–1506.
Tipperary Urban Council Accounts Dispute, *July 26*, 1504, 1505.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 17*, 4.
Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Curaheen
Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23*, 698, 699.

Cusack Estate
Purchase Negotiations, Progress of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 692.

Customs and Excise
Customs Report (1905–6) Presented, *July 19*, 343, 354.
Examining Officers, Second Class, Allowances to and Promotions of.
Qs. Mr. Masterman; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 164–166.

[*cont*.

Customs and Excise—*cont.*
Watchers, Customs Non-pensioner, Wages of.
Q. Mr. Masterman ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 19*, 355 ; *July 20*, 565.
Q. Mr. Whitehead ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1438.

Cyprus
Revenues—Return as to Interest on Turkish Loan paid in 1905–6, ordered, *July 19*, 354, Presented ; *July 25*, 1178.

D'Angely, Mrs., Case of
see under Police.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Natal Native Rising—Conduct of Operations, *July 18*, 186, 188, 191.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 154.

Dangerous Performances Bill
c. Order for Second Reading, read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 25*, 1368.

Davies, Mr. E. W. [Carnarvon, Eifon]
Sheriffs, High, Procedure in Nominating, *July 24*, 1055.
Unemployed
Grant for, from Consolidated Fund, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 458.
Problem, Method of dealing with—Question of Agricultural Districts, etc., *July 19*, 457, 458.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
India—Hours of Labour in Textile Factories, *July 26*, 1444.

Davies, Mr. T. H. [Hackney, N.]
Baghdad Railway, Information as to, *July 24*, 1037.
Ceylon Pearl Fisheries—Cost of Pearl Separating Machinery, etc., *July 24*, 1034.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1064, 1065.
Russo-Japanese War—Settlement of Claim in "Knight Commander" Case, *July 24*, 1037.

Davies, Mr. W. H. [Bristol, S.]
Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1355.

Dean Forest (Re-committed) Bill
c. *Com.** and 3R.*., *July 20*, 638.
l. 1R.* *July 23*, 643.

Deanery of Manchester Bill
c. 2R., *July 19*, 500.
Com., *July 23*, 830.
Rep. and 3R.,* *July 23*, 835.
l. 1R.* *July 24*, 899.

Defence of the Empire
Committee of Defence, Constitution of.
Q. Major Seely ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 735, 736.
Opportunity for Discussing Vote for.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 216, 217.
Value of.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 24*, 941.
Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*
Expansion Outside limits of Regular Forces, Necessity for.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *July 19*, 469 ; Lord Castlereagh, 473 ; Earl Roberts, *July 24*, 921–923 ; Duke of Bedford, 932, 933.
Total Expenditure on.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 24*, 969 ; Lord Grimthorpe, 990.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's Co., Ossory]
Barrow River, Drainage Proposals, *July 24*, 1025.
Caldbeck Estate—Proposals as to Sale of Ballacolla, *July 23*, 703.
Cryan, Constable, Offer made by, to pay share of Damages in Carroll Case, *July 23*, 702.
Portarlington Police Force, Strength of, *July 17*, 37 ; *July 24*, 1048.

Dell River
Drainage of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Flynn ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 24*, 1051, 1052.

Denbigh, Earl of
Army—Artillery
Importance of, Necessity for Maintaining full Strength in Men and Guns, etc., *July 24*, 956–966.
Militia Garrison—Utilising for Ammunition Columns, *July 24*, 962–964.
Reorganisation of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 956–966.
Tobacco growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 7, 8, 11, 13.

Denman, Lord
Congested Districts Ireland—Commission of Inquiry.
Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc., *July 23*, 660, 661.
Scope of, *July 23*, 659.
Tobacco growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 6, 10, 12.

Derby Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *July 23*, 641.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill
c. Lords Amendments *Con.** *July 19*, 352.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts, Chippenham]
Street Traffic Commission Report—Proposals for adopting Recommendation, *July 23*, 737.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Africa, South
British Indians, Rights of, etc., *July 25*, 1189.
Garrison in, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 377.
Army
Mountain Batteries, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 377.
Personnel, Proposals for Reduction of, *July 24*, 1030.
Brunei, Position of Affairs in, *July 26*, 1455.
Factories' Acts Particulars Section, Industries to be included in, *July 24*, 1039.
House of Commons Refreshment Committee, System of Supply of Crockery to, *July 26*, 1430.
Indian Army Expenditure—Effect of new Redistribution Scheme, etc., *July 19*, 380.
Zanzibar—Decision as to Abolition of Slavery on Mainland, *July 26*, 1448.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Dogs Bill
c. Con., *July 24*, 1154.
3R. *July 24*, 1175.
l. 1R.* *July 26*, 1370.
Debate on Consideration (Commons), *July 24*, 1155.
Cattle
Burial of Carcases of, *Proviso* as to, 1174, 1175.
Extension of Definition, to include Poultry, etc., proposed, 1161, 1162.
Chasing of Sheep, Withdrawal of Regulation as to, proposed, 1165, 1166.
Destruction of Dogs
Fourteen Days' Notice instead of Seven, proposed, 1173, 1174.
Method of Effecting to be as Painless as Possible, 1174.
Extension of Scope of Bill to any Injury Caused by a Dog, proposed, 1155–1158.

Dogs Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Consideration—*cont.*
Name Plates, Allowing use of Irish Characters in Ireland, proposed, 1167–1173.
No fee to be paid in respect of any Application or Consent under the Act, proposed, 1174.
Onus of Proof, Withdrawal of Clause as to, proposed, 1158–1161.
Register to be kept of Dogs taken to Homes and to be Open to Inspection on Payment of a Shilling, proposed, 1174.

Dolan, Mr. (Leitrim, N.)
Drumkeerin and Dowra, Reason for Employment of Extra Police at, etc., *July 23*, 691.

Donegal
Grand Jury, Alleged Exclusion of Catholics from.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1423.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Army
Artillery
Conservative Government, Policy of, *July 24*, 902–905.
Militia Garrison—Utilising for Ammunition Columns, *July 24*, 910.
Strength of, *July 24*, 902, 903.
Terms of Service in, Alteration of, *July 24*, 905.
Expeditionary Force, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 902.
Guards
Cost of, Compared with the Line, *July 24*, 906, 947.
Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 906.
Home Battalions, Proposals as to Reduction of, *July 24*, 907.
Personnel
Reduction of, Proposals as to *July 24*, 899, 913, 915, 1012.
Eight Battalions, *July 24*, 907–909.
Wastage, Allowance for, *July 24*, 913.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 24*, 901–916.
Opportunity for Discussion of *July 24*, 900, 916.

Egypt, Garrison in, Proposals as to Reduction of, *July 24*, 909, 910.

[*cont.*

Donoughmore, Earl of—*cont.*
  Militia
    Conditions of Service, *July 24*, 973.
    Foreign Service for, Proposals as to *July 24*, 910–912.
  Volunteers, Organisation of, by Means of County Associations, *July 24*, 913.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
  Trawlers, Foreign in Prohibited Waters, Decision of Sheriff Guthrie as to, *July 25*, 1198.

Douglas [Cork]
  O'Connor, Major, Charge against—Decision of Magistrates, etc.
    Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 688.

Dover Corporation Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.), Bill
  c. 2R., *July 25*, 1345.

Dowlais Gas Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Dowra
  Extra Police, Reason for Employment of—Payment of Cost, etc.
    Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 691.

Dromore
  Drainage Scheme, Report on.
    Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1440.

Drumkeerin
  Disturbances arising out of Boycott of C. Brady—Measures taken for Preservation of Peace, etc.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 206.
  Extra Police, Reason for Employment of—Payment of Cost, etc.
    Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 691.

Drumlish
  Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 1052, 1053.

Dublin
  Corporation
    Charges of Corruption against—Inquiry proposed.
      Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 687.
    Clerkships, Procedure in Appointing to.
      Q. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. McVeagh; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1211.
  Government Offices, Temporary Clerkships in
    Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 24*, 1019.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
  Athenry—Caheroyan Property, Purchase of, proposed, *July 26*, 1422.
  Blake Estate Grazing Farm, Purchase of, proposed, *July 19*, 357.
  Craughwell Horse Maiming Outrage—Police Efforts to Trace Offender, etc., *July 26*, 1415.
  Gort Property of Lord Gough—Result of Negotiations, *July 26*, 1413.
  Kinvara Harbour Improvements, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1414.
  Lambert Minors' Estate
    Alleged Visits of Police to Tenants, *July 19*, 376.
    Sale of, *July 26*, 1423.
  Loughrea—Alleged Attack on Police by Emergency Man Niland, *July 26*, 1414.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 515.
  Ryfield—Threat used against Police, *July 25*, 1212.

Duke of York's School
  Site, Decision as to Disposal of.
    Q. Major Anstruther Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1426.

Duncan, Mr. C. [Barrow-in-Furness]
  Army
    Ordnance Factories—Privileges as to. Accident Pay, etc., Provision of cost of, *July 24*, 1033.
    Rifles, Defective, Understanding as to, *July 24*, 1033.
  Liverpool Customs Transhipment Regulations, *July 18*, 163.
  Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Society, Power to turn into Limited Liability Company, *July 24*, 1044.
  Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory Employees—Alleged Refusal of Re-employment, *July 24*, 1032.
  Trinidad
    Borough Council—Decision as to use of Elective Principle, *July 24*, 1036.
    Financial Condition—Estimates for Current Year, etc., *July 24*, 1037.
    Legislative Council, Alleged Unrepresentative System in, *July 24*, 1035.

Duncan, Mr. J. H. [Yorks., W.R., Otley]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—Non-provided Schools Continued as Private Schools, Teachers' Pension Rights in, *July 19*, 406.

Dungannon
John Street New Schools, Expediting Building of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1411.

Dunraven Estates
Sale of, Reinstatements Effected, etc.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 684, 685.

Earlsfort
Cattle Outrage on Mr. Kennedy's Farm—Police Efforts to Trace Offenders, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 358.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Licensed Premises on Estates of.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 17*, 17.
Q. Mr. Crossley; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 17*, 17.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 17*, 35.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 26*, 1469.
Sunday Sale of Drink, Attitude towards.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 17*, 35, 36.

Edinburgh
Royal Scottish Museum, Ventilation of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 26*, 1468.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 19*, 341.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 24*, 1013.

Education, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T. Lough.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, &c.) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, &c.) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 21*, 533.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.*, *July 20*, 538.

Education, England and Wales
[*See also names of places.*]
Children of one Local Education Authority educated by another, Payment for.
Q. Mr. Winfrey; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 19, 20.
Code—Preparatory Memorandum, Subjects dealt with in.
Qs. Sir H. Craik, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 1195, 1196.

Education, England and Wales—*cont.*
Fees, Elementary Schools charging.
Q. Mr. Fullerton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 732.
Free Education in Public Elementary School, Right to Claim.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 26*, 1464.
Rate Applications received for Sanction of Board to raising (1903–5).
Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 180.
Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of, etc.—Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return.
Os. Archbishop of Canterbury, *July 26*, 1373–1386; Bishop of St. Asaph, 1386–1389; Viscount Halifax, 1389–1390; Lord Burghclere, 1390–1392; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 1392–1395; Bishop of Southwark, 1395; Earl of Crewe, 1396–1406.
Inspection and Examination, Provisions as to.
Os. Archbishop of Canterbury, *July 26*, 1377–1380, 1385, 1386, 1406; Lord Burghclere, 1390; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 1394; Earl of Crewe, 1402–1404.
Schools in which no Religious Instruction is given.
Q. Mr. Partington; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 20.
School Buildings, Improvements, etc., Delay of Sanction to, pending passing of Bill, proposed.
Q. Colonel Warde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 182.
Schools Certified Efficient, Number of and Attendance at, etc.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 34.
Teachers
Pupil Teachers
Grants for, under Article 27.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 731.
Training Centres, Decision as to closing.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr Birrell, *July 18*, 197, 198.
Register of Teachers, Proposals as to establishing.
Q. Sir G. Kekewick; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 19*, 371.
Salaries, Increases of
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 1184.
Training Colleges—Undenominational Colleges, Increase in Number of.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 730, 731.
Vaccination, *see that title.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill
c. Com., July 17, 41; *July 18*, 218.
Rep., July 18, 319.
Con., July 23, 741; *July 24*, 1058; *July 25*, 1222.
Act of 1870—Re-enactment of Section 87, proposed.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 26*, 1433, 1434.
Amendments to Clauses 2 and 4, Proposals as to.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 733.
Clause 4, Division on
Vote recorded in wrong Lobby.
Os. Mr. C. E. Shaw, Mr. Speaker, *July 26*, 1478.
Debates in Committee (Commons), *July 17*, 41; *July 18*, 218; on Consideration, *July 23*, 741; *July 24*, 1058; *July 25*, 1222.
Boarding-out System, Position of, 220–222.
Children living outside Three-Mile Limit, Conveyances for, 798–800.
Church of England, Blow aimed at, alleged, 1229, 1230, 1268, 1270.
Clause 2
In page 2, line 16, after the word "public" to insert the words "or educational," 1062.
Insertion of words in Page 2, Line 13.
"Not incongruous with trusts on which the schoolhouse is held," 1060–1062.
"Or public or social utility," after the word "Purpose," 1060.
"Or permit it to be used either in consideration of a payment or free of charge," after word "School-house," 1060.
Sub-section (2), Elimination of, proposed, 1058–1060.
Clause 4
Discussion of, Inadequate Time allowed for 742, 746, 748, 754, 756, 757
Government Amendments, 1275, 1305.
Effect of, 742, 743, 746, 755.
Clause 25, Discussion of, Inadequate Time allowed for, 746, 747, 748, 749, 753, 754.
Clause 37, Government Amendments to, Procedure as to, 57, 59, 60, 62, 65, 66, 67, 73, 98, 109, 110, 111.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates in Committee—*cont.*
Clause 38, omission of words "with the consent of the local education authority," proposed, 222 223.
Clause 39, insertion of words "or withheld," after word "made" in line 10, 224–226.
Clause 40, omission from word "enactment" to end of Subsection (1), proposed, 226.
Council for Wales, proposed Establishment of, 41–100, 103–118, 741. 742, 745, 747, 749–756, 758.
Appeals to, Provisions as to, 47, 48, 54, 55, 112–114.
Default Act, Effect on, 99, 100.
Distribution of Powers and Duties as between the Council, Board of Education and Member appointed to represent the Council in Parliament, 106–118.
Appeals, Provisions as to, 112–115.
Tabling Orders in Council relating to, proposed, 116, 117.
Functions of, information as to, 45-49, 52.
Home Rule, stepping-stone to, alleged, 59, 60, 69, 109.
Member of Parliament to be appointed to be responsible for any Act of the Council, 79–100.
Minister to deal with Welsh Education and sit in the House, proposals as to, 45, 53, 54, 58–68, 73, 76, 79, 742, 745, 747, 752, 754, 755, 758.
Procedure as to, Status of Precedent for, etc., 79-100.
Relations with Board of Education, Definition of, 89, 93–95, 98.
Salary and Staff of, Provisions for, 81–89.
Minority of each Constituent Local Authority, Representation of, 103–105.
President of Board of Education to be responsible to Parliament for Acts of, proposed, 41–50, 52–54, 62, 76, 77, 78.
Public Opinion in Wales, 42, 43, 50, 51, 70, 71, 72.
Welsh Central Board, Functions of, 45, 108.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Government Amendments, 1310, 1315, 1319, 1325–1328, 1331, 1335, 1341.
  - Greenwich Royal Hospital School, Inclusion of in scope of Clause 38, 218.
  - Managers, Proportion to be appointed by Local Education Authorities, and by Minor Local Authority 796–798.
  - New Clause, Terms of, 227–242.
  - Powers to dispose of Questions under Section 13 of Act of 1902, 224–226.
  - Recommittal of Bill with respect to Clauses 4, and 25, proposed, 741–760.
  - Religious Instruction
    - "All-round Facilities" or "right of entry," Granting, proposed, 1293–1300.
    - Ballot
      - Method of Taking, and Form of Question to be put to Parents, 1275, 1276.
      - Parents Voting to be Counted as Representative, proposed, 1276–1280.
      - To precede the Inquiry, proposed, 1275.
    - Cowper-Temple System.
      - Advantages and Disadvantages of, 764, 765, 766, 770, 772, 773, 774, 776–788.
      - Definition of Teaching as "the Christian Faith, as set forth in the Apostles' Creed," proposed, 791–796.
      - History of, 763, 764, 767.
    - Denominational Teaching in hitherto Non-provided Schools, Facilities for, 234–239, 742–745, 810.
      - Cost of, Principle of Apportionment of, 1127–1134.
      - Dispute as to—Facilities for Appeal to Board of Education, proposed, 1134–1140, 1234.
      - Granting of, by Local Authorities to be made compulsory, if demanded by Parents of four-fifths of Children, 1222–1248.
      - Number of Children to be taught, taking into Consideration, proposed, 1123, 1124.
      - Number of Teachers available for, taking into Consideration, 1113–1120.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Religious Instruction—*cont.*
    - Denominational Teaching, etc.—*cont.*
      - Period for, Powers of Local Authorities as to, 1107–1120.
      - "Reasonable Number" of Parents, Substitution of, for "Four-fifths," proposed, 1283–1290.
      - Refusal of Local Authorities to Grant—Powers of Board of Education to compel by *Mandamus*, 1233, 1234, 1239, 1240.
      - Right of Parent to demand, 772, 773, 774, 775, 784, 810.
      - Roman Catholic opinion as to, 779, 780, 1225, 1227.
      - Rural Areas having a Population under 5000, Extension of Facilities under Clause 4 to, proposed, 1251–1272.
      - Teachers, *see under that sub-heading.*
      - Two Mornings a Week, proposed, 1102–1104, 1109.
    - Instruction in Tenets and Formularies of any Religious Denomination, Granting Powers to Local Authorities, proposed, 763–788.
    - Satisfaction felt with present System, Alleged, 775, 776, 778.
    - Special Facilities under Clause 3, Definition of, proposed, 1097–1102.
  - Schemes with Reference to Delegation by Local Authorities—New Clause, 245–269, 302.
    - Engagement and Dismissal, and Fixing of Salaries of Teachers, Question as to Delegating Powers regarding, 281–290.
    - "Except where the County Council has authorised any Proposal and Estimate, relating thereto," proposed, 279–281.
    - Exclusion of any Questions arising out of Transfer of Voluntary Schools, or Granting of Facilities, proposed, 272–274.
    - Expenditure, Limiting Liability to each Area, proposed, 295–297.
    - Financial Responsibility—Substitution of "may" for "shall," proposed, 293–295.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debates in Committee—*cont.*
Schemes—*cont.*
Omission of words, "Throughout their County to Representative Bodies as defined by this Section," proposed, 271, 272.
School Attendance By-laws Enforcement, Objections to Delegating Powers as to, 274–276.
Substitution of "may" for "shall" in Line 1, proposed, 269–271.
Schools for Demonstration and Practice connected with Training Colleges, Inclusion of, in Parliamentary Grant, proposed, 218–220, 224.
Teachers
Allowance to Teachers losing Employment in Consequence of this Act—New Clause, 311.
Deferred Annuity Fund, Charge on the Treasury—Question as to Recommitting Bill in order to deal with, 758–760.
Religious Denominational Instruction, by
Local Authority to Appoint Teachers willing to give, Proposed, 1305, 1306.
Number of Teachers available, Taking into Consideration, 1113–1120.
Training Colleges, Nonconformist Grievances as to, 771.
Transferring Education Work of London County Council to a Body directly Elected, proposed, 819–829.
Voluntary Schools
Agreement for Transfer refused by Local Authority or Owners —Granting Power of Appeal to Board of Education to continue School, proposed, 1062–1084.
Buildings
Power to Require Use of School-house for Educational Purposes out of School Hours — New Clause, 305.
Use of, by Local Authorities for any Educational Purpose, Proposals as to, 1058–1060.
Cases of Dispute between Owners, and Local Authorities, Right of Appeal to Education Board, 230, 232, 233, 237, 239, 240.
Compulsory Acquisition of by Local Authorities, Proposals as to, 227–242.

Education (England and Wales Bill)—*cont.*
Debates in Committee—*cont.*
Voluntary Schools—*cont.*
Contracting out, Powers as to, 1062–1084, 1243.
Denominational Teaching in hitherto Non-provided Schools, *see under subheadin* Religious Instruction—Denominational.
Discontinuance of, Public Notice to be given of, and Right of Appeal to be granted, proposed, 800–816.
Granting of Religious Facilitie not to be a Condition o taking over by Local Authorities, proposed, 1087–1094.
Power of Education Board to allow School to continue as a State-aided School, Receiving Grant, but not Rate Aid, 1062–1084. 1243.
Eyeglasses, Power to provide, under Clause 35.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 170.
House of Lords, Progress in, Proposals as to
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, Marquess of Ripon, *July 20*, 537, 538.
Local Education Authorities' Travelling Expenses, Payment of, proposed.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 26*, 1433.
Minister for Wales, Information as to.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Birrel', *July 23*, 732.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1022.
Office Accommodation required for.
Q. Mr. W. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 26*, 1468.
Religious Instruction
Books and Apparatus for Denominational Instruction, Provision of.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1022.
Expenses, Payment of.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 19*, 406.
Separate Arrangement with existing Teachers, Powers of Managers to make.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 20.
Section 37, Sub-section (8), Order in Council under, Means of preventing from coming into force.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 23*, 733.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
State-aided Schools
Effect of Clause 26 upon Schools under Clause 4.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1021, 1022.
Public Elementary Schools, Decision as to.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 20*, 569.
Teachers' Pension Rights in Non-provided Schools continued as Private Schools.
Q. Mr. J. H. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 19*, 406

Education, Ireland
See also names of Places.
Afflicted Children, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1218.
Commissioners, Names, etc., of.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 701; *July 24*, 1023.
Inspectors
Notification of Visits of.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 690.
Religion of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 702.
Intermediate—Royal Dublin Society Inquiry into working of Act, in 1897, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 178.
National School Teachers
Civil Rights, Amendment of Rules as to.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 168.
Examinations—Classification of Passes.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 689.
Extern Teachers, Rules as to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 209, 210.
Security of Tenure—Memorials from Protestant Teachers Union.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 687.
Primary, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 408.
Rule 127 (B), Abolition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 684.
School Building Plans, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 24*, 1052.
Qs. Colonel McCalmont, Sir T. Esmonde; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1413.

Education, Ireland—*cont.*
"Two-Teacher" School, Definition of.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 684.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1025.

Education of Defective Children (Scotland) Bill
l, Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Education (Provision of Meals) Bill
c. Special Report from the Select Committee, *July 17*, 40.
Instruction to Select Committee, *July 25*, 1368.

Education, Scotland
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
See also names of Places.
Minute as to Special Grants, Presented, *July 23*, 643, 673.
Pupil Teachers
Grants for—Decision as to Abolition, etc.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 19*, 406.
New Regulations as to—Opportunity for discussing.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 1478.
Status of, after 1914.
Qs. Mr. Black, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 17*, 37.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1159.

Egypt
British Officers, Attack on.
Correspondence Presented, *July 26*, 1369, 1410.
Discussion of Papers, etc., Opportunity for.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 737.
Photographs of Execution of Sentences, Authority for publishing.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 370.
British Officials of Ministry of Finance, Pensions awarded to.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 392, 393.
Cromer, Lord, and Sir M. McIlwraith, Leave of Absence granted to.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 390, 391.
Education of Natives—Percentage of Illiterates, etc.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 393.

[*cont.*

Egypt—*cont.*
  Garrison in.
    Bullock, General, Furlough granted to, etc.
      Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 367.
    Proposals as to Reduction of.
      Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 909, 910.
    Reduction in 1905, Officers deprived of Employment by, etc.
      Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1031.
  Mex—Assault on British Soldier by Natives.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 356.
  Seresinah, Corpse of Native found near—Charge against British Soldier, etc.
    Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 391.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 20*, 563.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 20*, 563.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
  l. Com. July 23*, 642.
    Rep. July 24*, 898.
  3R.* *July 26*, 1369.

Elgin and Kincardine, Earl of—*Secretary of State for the Colonies.*
  Scottish Church Property Dispute—Date of Completion of Work of Commissioners, Inconvenience caused by Delay, etc., *July 20*, 559–562.

Ellenborough, Lord
  Merchant Vessels, Capture of, at Sea, in Time of War—Question of National Indemnity
    Avoidance of Capture—Instructional Courses at Seaports, proposed, *July 23*, 644–647.
    Committee of Inquiry—Retention of Services of Naval Member until Completion of Report, *July 23*, 644.
  Motor Omnibuses, Noise, Annoyance, and Injury caused by, in London, Proposals for mitigation, *July 20*, 551.

Ellis, Rt. Hon. J. E.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
  Army Medical Service—Specialists Appointed, *July 25*, 1188.
  Native States under Control of Politica Agents, *July 24*, 1034.

Eltham
  Deansfield Road School, London County Council, Proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Birrell *July 26*, 1434.

Ely Estate
  Sale, Proposals for.
    Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1412.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
  Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1354, 1357.
  Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill, Carrying over to Autumn Session, *July 26*, 1409.

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Erroll, Earl of
  Army
    Expeditionary Force, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 996.
    Guards
      Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 996, 997.
    Personnel, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 995.
    Reorganisation Proposals, *July 24*, 994–998.
  Militia
    Foreign Service for, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 996.
    Officers
      Shortage of, Proposals for dealing with, *July 24*, 996.
    Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 995, 996.
  Volunteers, Organisation of, by Means of County Associations, *July 24*, 998.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
  Arklow Harbour Works, Grant for, etc. *July 26*, 1421.
  Education—School Building Grant for Ferns, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1413.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill *Con.*, *July 24*, 1072, 1111; *July 25*, 1226, 1300.
  Poor Law Children—Boarding-out System, Extension of, proposed, *July 26*, 1503.
  Vagrancy in Ireland, Necessity for dealing with, *July 26*, 1503, 1504.

Essex, Mr. R. W. [Gloucestershire, Cirencester]
Leckhampton Right of Way Disturbances, Sentences inflicted, etc., *July 23*, 726, *July 25*, 1191, 1192.

Estimates
See also titles Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July* 17, 89–91, 105.

Evans-Gordon, Major Sir W. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
India
Administrative Policy of the Government, *July 20*, 622.
Baroda, Poppy cultivation in, *July 19*, 382.
Condition and Progress, Material and Moral, *July 20*, 623, 624.
Exports and Imports, Statistics as to, *July 20*, 623, 624.
Land, Revenue derived from, *July 20*, 624, 625.
Mortality, Rate of, Alleged Increase in, *July 20*, 623.
Natives, Question as to Employment of, in higher Administrative Posts, *July 20*, 627.
Nizam's Territory, importation of Opium into, *July 19*, 382.
Opium Trade, Revenue derived from, *July 20*, 625, 626.
Salt Tax
Amount of, etc., *July 19*, 381.
Reductions effected in, *July 20*, 626.
Police, Metropolitan
D'Angely, Madame, Result of Inquiry into Antecedents of, *July 19*, 395.
Yiddish, Rewards for Proficiency in *July 19*, 394, 395; *July 23*, 727.
Russia—Case of Mr. Geddes, *July 19*, 370.
Turco-Persian Boundary Dispute—British Government Attitude, *July 19*, 391.

Everett, Mr. R. L. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 281.

Eversley of Old Ford, Baron
Introduced to House of Lords, *July 23*, 641.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
Date of Introducing.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 1476.

Explosives Bill
c. 1R.* *July 19*, 419.

Exports and Imports
Ireland—Compilation of Returns as to Exports, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1047.

Extradition Bill
c. 2R., *July 18*, 339.
Com., *July 19*, 529.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 19*, 531.

Faber, Capt. W. V. [Hants, Andover]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1161, 1175.
Education Bill—Religious Instruction—Powers of Managers to make separate Arrangement with existing Teachers, *July 17*, 20.
Postmasters, Sub—Holiday Regulations, *July 25*, 1181.

Factories and Workshops
Jam Factories, Overtime Regulations in.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17*, 18, 19.
Time-Cribbing, Police Employment to prevent—Replies of Local Authorities.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 20*, 565.
Particulars Section, Industries to be included in.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Gladstone. *July 24*, 1039.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
County, District, and Municipal Councils
Administrative work of, Interference with, by Local Government Board, *July 26*, 1486–1493.
Membership of, Removal of Disqualifications, proposed, *July 26*, 1492, 1493.
Cusack Estate, Purchase Negotiations, Progress of, *July 23*, 692.
Drumlish Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *July 24*, 1052, 1053.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 853.
Local Government Board
Account Forms, Objections to, *July 26*, 1490, 1491.
Auditors, Qualifications of, etc., *July 26*, 1489, 1490.
Longford
Land Purchase in, *July 25*, 1206.
Magistracy, Religion of, *July 24*, 1050.
March Assizes—Case of J. McCann, *July 24*, 1046.
Maconely Estate—Turbary Rights of Tenants, *July 25*, 1207, 1208.
Thompson (Clonfin) Estate Sale Negotiations, Progress of, *July 23*, 693.
Workhouses, Administration and Cost of, *July 26*, 1488, 1489.

Feagh
National School—Case of Mr. R. I. McCurdy.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 376.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
Army—Reductions Estimated saving in Vote, *July 23*, 706.
Japanese Army, Alleged increase of, *July 19*, 369.
"Montagu," H.M.S., Expenditure on salving, *July 19*, 378.
Motor Omnibuses—Speed Regulations in London, *July 23*, 729.
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Amusements, Government Support for Provision of, *July 19*, 390.

Fermanagh
Celebrations on July 12, Breaches of the Peace occurring at, etc.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1440.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill
c. 3R., *July 18*, 332.
l. 1R.,* *July 19*, 344.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.]
Ely Estate, Sale Proposals for, *July 26*, 1412.
Fermanagh July 12 Celebrations, Breaches of the Peace occurring at, *July 26*, 1440.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 861, 862, 887, 888.

Fetlar
Bridge and Road Construction, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 18*, 198, 199.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Arva—Police Assistance at Eviction of Mr. Mulligan, *July 25*, 1184.
Civil Service Second Division Clerks desirous of Transfer, List of, proposed, *July 24*, 1019.
Dublin Government Offices, Temporary Clerkships in, *July 24*, 1019.
Education
  Commissioners, Names, etc., of, *July 23*, 701; *July 24*, 1023.
  Inspectors, Religion of, *July 23*, 702.
Gambling—Protection of Shareholders from Bull and Bear Operations, etc., *July 17*, 21.
Income Tax Committee, Extension of Terms of Reference of, proposed, *July 24*, 1022.
Penny Post, Universal—German Attitude, *July 17*, 17.
Post Office Savings Bank—List of Depositors of Unclaimed Balances proposed, *July 24*, 1015.

Fiennes, Mr. E. E. [Oxfordshire, Banbury]
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Repatriation, Petition of Miners against, *July 23*, 712, 713.

Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland
Return 190, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 215.

Finlay Estate
McGovern, P., Area of holding of
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1182.

First Commissioner of Works
Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Lord Tweedmouth.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Fisheries
Scotland—Curing Industry, Sanitary Supervision of
Qs. Mr. Chiozza-Money, Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1459, 1460.

Fitzmaurice, Lord—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs*
Macedonia—Greek Bands, Incursion of—Representations to Greek Government, proposed, *July 20*, 349–351.

Flavin, Mr. M. J [Kerry, N.]
Education—School Building Plans, Reason for Delay as to, *July 24*, 1052.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 857, 885.

Florists
Assistants, Hours of—Application of Factory Act, proposed.
Q. Mr. Chiozza-Money; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1460.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Cork Evicted Tenants—Progress made with Reinstatement of, *July 18*, 211.
Deel River,—Drainage of, proposed, *July 24*, 1051, 1052.
Financial Return No. 190—Information as to, *July 18*, 215.
Kanturk
  Reinstatement Claims of Mrs. A. Connell, J. Culhane, and T. Donovan, *July 18*, 177, 204, 205.
  School—Reason for Dismissal of Mr. J. P. O'Connor, *July 18*, 177.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 838, 841.

[*cont.*

Flynn, Mr. J. C.—*cont.*
Natal Native Rising
Bishop of Zululand's allegations against Col. Royston's Column, *July 23*, 718.
Military Operations, Responsibility for, *July 26*, 1452, 1453.
South African War—Expanding Bullet Use of, *July 19*, 388.
Trade Statistics, Irish—Weekly Returns, proposed, *July 24*, 1054.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill
l. Commons' Amendments *Con.** *July 17*, 4.
Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill
*c. Con.** *July 18*, 161.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.

Forestry
Afforestation
Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. MacLean; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 1194, 1195.
Unemployed Persons, Provision of Work for.
Os. Mr. Alden, *July 19*, 446; Mr. J. Burns, 460, 461.

Forfar Corporation Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H.—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster* [Wolverhampton, E.]
Education (England and Walss) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 240–242; *Con.*, *July 23*, 783–785.
India
Administrative Policy of the Government, *July 20*, 611, 614–616.
Land, Revenue derived from, *July 20*, 612, 613.
Mortality—Rate of, Alleged increase in *July 20*, 613.
Salt Tax—Reductions effected in, *July 20*, 612.
Taxation—Incidence of, Amount per Head of Population, etc., *July 20*, 611, 612.
India Office—Salary of Secretary of State, placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20*, 615.

Fowney
Bailey, Mr. R., Malicious Outrages on Property of—Police Efforts to trace Offenders, etc.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1424, 1425.

France
Budget (1906) Presented, *July 23*, 643.

Fullerton, Mr. H. [Cumberland, Egremont]
Education—Fees, Elementary Schools Charging, *July 23*, 732.
Withington Workhouse, Alleged Defects in Administration of, *July 19*, 401.

Galway
Condition of County, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Speaker, *July 25*, 1212, 1213.

Gambling
Shareholders—Protection of, from Bull and Bear Operations.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 17*, 21.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 17*, 13.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 17*, 13.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 17*, 13.

Gascoigne Estate
Kilfinane Portion, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1415, 1416.

Geevagh
Band Practice on Sunday—Alleged Police Interference with, *July 19*, 409.

Germany
Navy, Information as to Guns used in.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 18*, 185.

Gibbs, Mr. G. A. [Bristol, W.]
Aland Islands, Russian Military Occupation of, *July 25*, 1190.
Army
Coldstream Guards, Third Battalion—Date of Departure for Egypt, *July 25*, 1185.
Reduction Proposals—Disposal of Officers, etc., of Disbanded Battalions, *July 18*, 184.

Gibraltar
  Garrison, Proposed Reduction of.
    Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 24*, 941, 945; Lord Tweedmouth, 974.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
  Brehon Laws Commission, Work of—Translation of Remaining Documents, proposed, *July 23*, 678.
  Congested Districts Commission, Scope of, *July 18*, 212, 213; *July 25*, 1204.
  Improvement of Landed Property Act, 1847—Loans issued under, Effect on Rents, etc., *July 25*, 1202.
  LabourersCottages Act—Extension of, to Farmers' Servant Men, proposed, *July 25*, 1201.
  Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 890.
  Land Purchase—Valuation Standard, Decision in Blake Forster Case, etc., *July 18*, 170.
  Local Government Board—Administration of, Excessive Cost, etc., *July 26*, 1517–1519.
  Malone Estate, Sale of—Disposal of Lands, etc., *July 18*, 201; *July 25*, 1204, 1205.
  Royal Canal, Condition of—Appointment made on Board of Control, etc., *July 18*, 200.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
  Channel Islands, Extension of Merchant Shipping Laws to, *July 17*, 33.
  Children, Employment of—Date of Sanctioning London By-laws, *July 23*, 677.
  Coal Mine Inspection in Wales—Duties of Mr. Atkinson, etc., *July 17*, 32, 33; *July 19*, 396.
  Criminal Offences, etc.
    Returns, Omission of Names of Acquitted Persons from, proposed, *July 18*, 194.
    Sentences of Imprisonment on Males over Twenty-one passed during Last Twelve Months, *July 23*, 699.
  Factories
    Jam Factories, Overtime Regulations in, *July 17*, 19.
    Particulars Section, Industries to be included in, *July 24*, 1039.
  Gloucester Level Commissioners—Constitution Duties and Powers of, *July 19*, 395.
  Indian Penal Code—Inquiry into Working of, proposed, *July 23*, 724.
  Laundries, Inspection of
    Religious, etc., Institutions, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 728.
    Rule as to not divulging Names given in Reports, *July 23*, 727.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
  Leather, American—Complaints as to Adulteration of, *July 19*, 396.
  Leckhampton Right of Way Dispute—Sentences Inflicted, *July 23*, 726.
  Manchester Police, Charges against—Investigation, proposed, *July 19*, 371.
  Menston Lunatic Asylum Patients, Complaints as to Treatment of, *July 19*, 394.
  Midwives Act, 1902—Restrictions on Irish Midwives Practising in England, *July 24*, 1020.
  Motors
    Accidents
      Metropolitan Area, Statistics for June—Proposals for Protection of Public, etc., *July 19*, 397.
      Monthly Returns, proposed, *July 24*, 1040.
      Provincial Statistics for May and June, *July 19*, 394.
    Licences Suspended or Cancelled during 1906, *July 23*, 726.
    Petroleum Combustion, Noxious Odours caused by, *July 23*, 725; *July 24*, 1040.
    Speed—Privileges of CabinetMinisters, *July 23*, 725, 726.
  Musical Copyright Act, 1902,—Police Employed under, *July 23*, 740.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 503, 504, 514.
  Petroleum Importation—Powers of Thames Conservancy Board to control Movement from Landing Place, *July 18*, 182.
  Police
    Accidents—Monthly Returns by Police, proposed, *July 24*, 1040.
    Metropolitan
      D'Angely, Madame—Result of Inquiry into Antecedents of, *July 19*, 395.
      Inquiries by—Employment of Men in Plain Clothes, proposed, *July 18*, 194.
      Yiddish—Rewards for Proficiency in, *July 19*, 395; *July 23*, 727.
  Time-Cribbing, Employment of Police to Prevent—Opinions of Local Authorities, *July 20*, 565.
  Vaccination ExemptionCertificates—Power of Magistrate to grant to Applicant residing outside his Jurisdiction, *July 18*, 193.
  Workmen's Compensation Act—Reduction of Allowance, Powers of Judge as to, *July 23*, 729.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill
l. Commons' Amendt. *Con.* July 17*, 4.
Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Glantawe of Swansea, Baron
Introduced to House of Lords, *July 23*, 641.

Glasgow
Postmen, Allowances to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 25*, 1184.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill
c. Con., July 24, 1143.

Glen-Coats, Sir T. [Renfrewshire, W.]
Scottish Church Property Dispute—Delay in Presenting Report, *July 18*, 167.

Gloucester
Commissioners for Lower Level—Constitution, Duties and Powers of.
Q. Mr. Rendall; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 395.

Goddard, Mr. D. F. [Ipswich]
Public Accounts Committee Reports—Opportunity for Discussing, *July 19*, 412.

Gooch, Mr. G. P. [Bath]
Turkish Customs Duties, Decision as to, *July 23*, 723.

Goold Verschoyle Estate
Sale of, Price asked, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 692.

Gort
Gough, Lord, Property of—Result of Negotiations.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1413, 1414.

Gortregan
Postal Facilities—Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1473.

Goschen, Viscount
Army
Expenditure—Necessity for Reduction, *July 24*, 983, 984.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 24*, 983–986.
Army Council, Opinion of, *July 24*, 984, 985.
Malta—Garrison, Proposed Reduction of, *July 24*, 986.

Government Departments
Contracts made with Foreigners—Return Presented, *July 25*, 1178.

Granard, Earl of
Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1371.

Granby, Marquess of
Motor Omnibuses—Noise, Annoyance, and Injury caused by, in London, Measures proposed in Mitigation of, *July 20*, 539–544.
Traction Engines—Nuisance caused by, in London Streets, Restrictive Measures, proposed, *July 20*, 543.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire and East Coast Railways Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Great Northern (Ireland) and Midland Railways Bill
c. Rep. July 25*, 1177.

Great Northern Railway Bill
l. Rep. July 17*, 2.
3R.* *July 20*, 535.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill
c. Com., July 26, 1409.
Carrying over to Autumn Session.
O. Mr. Emmott, *July 26*, 1409.

Greenwich Observatory
London County Council Power Station—Proposals as to.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 1185.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]
Soudan—Vivisection Experiments at Gordon College, Khartoum, *July 20*, 568.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Baghdad Railway, Negotiations as to, *July 24*, 1038.
Bulgaria—Sofia, Decision as to Establishment of Bank, etc., at, *July 17*, 32.
China
Annui Mining Final Contract, Information as to, *July 26*, 1454.
Trade Mark Law, Date of bringing into Operation, etc., *July 26*, 1428.
Congo Free State
Stannard, Mr.—Result of Trial, etc., *July 19*, 392; *July 24*, 1039.
Egypt
British Officers, Attack on—Photographs of Execution of Sentences, Authority for Publishing, *July 19*, 370.
British Officials of Ministry of Finance, Pensions awarded to, *July 19*, 393.
Cromer, Lord. and Sir M. McIlwraith, Leave of Absence granted to, *July 19*, 391.
Education of Natives—Percentage of Illiterates, *July 19*, 393.

[*cont.*

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- Egypt—*cont.*
  - Mex-Assault on British Soldier by Natives, *July 19*, 356.
  - Seresinah, Corpse of Native found near—Charge against British Soldier, etc., *July 19*, 391.
- Manchuria, Protection of British Trade Interests in—Date of opening Port of Dalny, *July 19*, 393.
- Morocco
  - Police in Coast Towns, Powers of, to stop Slave Trading, *July 17*, 31.
  - Sale of Land to Foreigners, Regulations as to, *July 26*, 1453, 1454.
- Russia
  - Customs Tariff, New—Result of British Representations, *July 19*, 355; *July 26*, 1456.
  - Geddes, Mr., Case of—Progress of Negotiations, *July 19*, 370.
- Russo-Japanese War—Settlement of Claim in "Knight Commander" case, *July 24*, 1037.
- Servia
  - Belgrade—Decision as to Establishment of Bank, etc., *July 17*, 32.
  - Regicide Officers—Text of Decree as to Retirement of, *July 19*, 392.
- Soudan
  - Bahr-el-Gazal, Evacuation of, *July 26*, 1454.
  - Khartoum—Vivisection Experiments at Gordon College, *July 20*, 569
  - Spirituous Liquors, Statistics as to Importation of, *July 23*, 697.
- Turco-Persian Boundary Dispute—British Government Attitude, *July 19*, 391.
- Turkey
  - Customs Duties, Progress of Negotiations as to, *July 24*, 1038; *July 26*, 1455, 1456.
  - Maaghil Outrage, Persons implicated in, *July 19*, 356.

Grimthorpe, Lord
- Army
  - Auxiliary Forces — Re-organisation, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 990.
  - Expenditure, Necessity for Reduction in, *July 24*, 988.
  - Guards, Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 988.
  - Re-organisation proposals, *July 24*, 986–991.
    - Army Council, Opinion of, *July 24*, 989.
- Defence of the Empire, Total Expenditure on, *July 24*, 990.
- India—North-West Frontier, Troops required for Defence of, *July 24*, 989.
- Malta—Garrison, Proposed Reduction of *July 24*, 986.

Ground Game Bill
- *l.* Report from Standing Committee, *July 17*, 5.
  - Rep. * *July 20*, 537.

Guiana, British
- Disturbances — Further Correspondence, Presented, *July 23*, 643, 673.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 262; *Con.*, *July 23*, 778.

Hackney Electricity Bill
- *l. Rep.* July 24*, 897.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
- Africa, South, Garrison in—Proposals as to Replacing Disbanded Regiments, *July 18*, 176; *July 19*, 377.
- Artillery
  - Reserve, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1026.
  - Royal Field, Effect of Reductions on, *July 18*, 176.
- Bayonet, New, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1426.
- Canteens, System of Supplying—Case of Messrs. R. Dickeson and Co., *July 23*, 709.
- Civil Employment of Ex-Soldiers, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 174.
- Crimean War Pension of T. Loughlin, *July 23*, 697.
- Duke of York's School Site, Decision as to Disposal of, *July 26*, 1426.
- Egypt, British Garrison in
  - Bullock, General, Furlough Granted to, *July 19*, 367.
  - Reduction in 1905, Effect of, *July 24*, 1031.
- Estimates, Discussion of, further Time for —Statement made of *Times* Representatives by Member for Croydon, *July 19*, 414, 415.
- General Staff, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 377.
- Guards
  - Coldstream Guards—Third Battalion, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 177; *July 19*, 366.
    - Egypt, Date of Departure for, *July 25*, 1185.
  - Reduction, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1030.
- Home Battalions, Proposals as to Reduction of, *July 19*, 415, 470, 484, 489.
- Horses, Age for Purchase of, *July 18*, 172.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont*

Indian.

Drafts in 1904 and 1905, *July 18*, 172.

Mountain Batteries, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 377.

Proportion of Guns to Men, *July 19*, 367.

Japanese Army, Alleged Increase of, *July 19*, 369.

Jordan, Case of—Reason for Reinstatement as Quartermaster-Sergeant, *July 18*, 177.

Limerick Summer Assizes—Authority for Military Guard of Honour, *July 26*, 1443.

Midwives Act, 1902—Restrictions on Irish Midwives Practising in English Military Families Hospitals, *July 24*, 1027.

Militia

Camp Equipment, Regulations as to Taking over—Weight of Equipment issued to Fife Artillery, etc., *July 23*, 696.

Foreign Service for, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 487; *July 24*, 1027.

Garrison Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 175.

Norfolk Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 25.

Recruiting Statistics for 1904, *July 17*, 25.

Striking Force, Proposals as to Obtaining Men for, *July 24*, 1032.

Mobilisation, Troops Available for in 1899, *July 19*, 368.

Natal Native Rising—Bambaata, Decapitation of Corpse of—Identity of Officer Responsible, etc., *July 24*, 1031.

Newcastle-on-Tyne, King's Visit to—Alleged Hardship inflicted on Volunteers by Employers, *July 26*, 1427.

Ordnance Factories—Accident Pay, etc., Provision of Cost of Privileges, *July 24*, 1033.

Pensions, Weekly Payment of, proposed, *July 17*, 25.

Personnel, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 173; *July 19*, 414, 415; *July 24*, 1030.

Army Council, Views of, *July 24*, 1032.

Date of giving Directions for Disbandment, *July 19*, 367.

Deficiency in Regiments selected for, *July 18*, 175.

Eight Battalions, Proposals as to, *July 25*, 1187, 1188.

Officers and Men of Disbanded Battalions, Disposal of, *July 18*, 184.

Vote, Estimated Saving in, *July 23*, 706–708.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*

Piershill, Barracks, Sanitary Condition of, *July 26*, 1125, 1126.

Plain Clothes—Sergeants, Date of Issuing Instructions as to, *July 26*, 1443.

Pressley, Sergeant, T., Case of, *July 26*, 1425.

Recruiting and Enlistment Statistics for 1904, *July 17*, 25.

Reorganisation Proposals, *July 19*, 486, 487.

Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, *July 19*, 482–488.

Reserve

Number of, *July 19*, 368.

Transfers under New System, *July 23*, 695, 696.

Rifles, Contracts for, Provisions of, *July 24*, 1033.

Roher—Annoyance caused by Gun practice, *July 26*, 1426.

Short Tour, Battalions serving on, *July 18*, 174.

South African War

Remount Department Administration, Inquiry into Proposed, *July 19*, 378.

Reserve Officers, Senior, Consideration of Grievances of, *July 23*, 695.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory Employees—Alleged Refusal of Re-employment, *July 24*, 1033.

Territorial Army

Committee, Date of Presenting Report of, *July 19*, 369.

Scheme, Proposals as to, *July 26*, 1427.

Volunteers

Allocation of 149,000 under New Scheme, *July 19*, 367.

Artillery

Guns—Decision as to 15-pounders, *July 19*, 366.

Lanark, and 4th West Riding, proposals as to, *July 19*, 369.

Reduction Proposals, *July 18*, 184.

Training Proposals under New Scheme, *July 19*, 367.

War Office—Hackford Provision Company, Tenders received from, *July 18*, 184.

Wastage, Statistics for certain Battalions in 1904 and 1905, *July 19*, 366.

Woolwich Arsenal

Discharges (1903–1906), *July 23*, 680, 706.

Officials recently Appointed, Annual Cost of, *July 23*, 706.

Yeomanry in North of Ireland — Pay during Training, etc., *July 25*, 1186.

Halifax, Viscount
Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of—Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26*, 1389, 1390.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
Clare evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of, *July 17*, 16.
Irish Language, Proposals as to Teaching in Schools, *July 19*, 408.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 842, 852.
Poor Law (Ireland) Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 24*, 1047.

Halsbury, Earl of
Prevention of Corruption Bill, Commons Amendts. *Con.*, *July 26*, 1372.

Hammersmith, City and North East London Railway Bill
l. Motion for Suspension of Proceedings on till next Session, *July 17*, 2.

Hampstead
New End Schools, London County Council proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 26*, 1434.
Telephone Connection with Victoria.
Q. Lt. Col. Philipps; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1411, 1412.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 341.
*Rep.** *July 24*, 897.

Harbours
See Piers and Harbours, *also* Names of Places.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E. Rossendale]
Carnarvon Castle, proposals as to restoring, *July 19*, 375.
Edinburgh Royal Scottish Museum, Ventilation of, *July 26*, 1468.
Education Bill—Ministry for Wales, Office Accommodation required for, *July 26*, 1468.
House of Commons, Refreshment Committee, System of Supplying Crockery to, *July 26*, 1430.
Kew Gardens Painting Work, Wages paid for, *July 26*, 1467.
Whitehall—New War Office, Marble Dressing, Specifications as to, *July 26*, 1467.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Dogs Bill, *con.*, *July 25*, 1158, 1161.
Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1356.

Hardie, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
India
Administrative Policy of the Government, *July 20*, 595, 596.
Condition and Progress, Material and Moral, *July 20*, 596, 597.
Famine Relief, Statistics as to, *July 20*, 596, 597.
Mortality, Rate of, Alleged Increase in *July 20*, 596.
Natives, Question of Employment of, in higher Administrative Posts, *July 20*, 596, 597.
Salt Tax, Reductions Effected in, *July 20*, 595.
Textile Factories in, Conditions of Employment of — State Supervision of, proposed, *July 20*, 597.
India Office, Salary of Secretary of State, Placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20*, 595–597.
Natal Native Rising
Imperial Government Intervention, proposals as to, *July 19*, 413, 414.
Natives killed, wounded and Prisoners, Treatment of Prisoners, etc., *July 18*, 185, 186, 190, 191.
Prisoners, Native, taken and surrendered, *July 26*, 1449.

Hardinge, Viscount
Army, Reorganisation proposals, *July 24*, 949–952.
Militia
Foreign Service for, proposals as to, *July 24*, 951.
Officers, Shortage in, proposals for dealing with, *July 24*, 951.

Hardy, Mr. G. A. [Suffolk, Stow Market]
Poor Law Children—"Scattered Homes" System, extension of, proposed, *July 19*, 459.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1166.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 791–794; *July 24*, 1090, 1104.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
Alcohol, Industrial use of, Legislation to Facilitate, *July 18*, 330.
Revenue Bill 2R., *July 18*, 330.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1079.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
Achscrabster Allotments Scheme, Costs in connection with, *July 25*, 1179.
Thurso District Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 23*, 698.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
India—Hours of Labour in Textile Factories, *July 26*, 1444.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 506–508.

Haslam, Mr. L. [Monmouth Boroughs]
Poor Law Children—Cost of Maintenance under Various Systems, *July 24*, 1041.

Haslingden Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Havana United Railways and Regla Warehouses Bill
c. Con. July 23*, 671.
3R.* *July 26*, 1408.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill, 3R., *July 18*, 337.
Crown Lands Bill, 3R., *July 25*, 1367.
Deanery of Manchester Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 500, 501; *Com.*, *July 23*, 831.
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1158, 1162, 1172.
Extradition Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 339; *Com.*, *July 19*, 529, 531.
Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1150.
Income Tax Commissioners—Extra Work, Proposals as to Additional Pay for, *July 18*, 328.
Isle of Man [Customs] Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 147.
Land Tax Acts Commissioners, Emoluments of, alleged Interference with, *July 18*, 328.
Land Tax Commissioners Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 639.
Marine Insurance Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1557.
Marriage with Foreigners Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 339; *Com.*, *July 19*, 528.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 514.
Open Spaces Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 501.
Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill, *Com.*, *July 25*, 1364.
Post Office Sites Bill, 3R., *July 17*, 144.
Prisons, Local—Scale of Pay of Officers, *July 26*, 1457.
Public Trustee Bill, Liabilities incurred by Public Trustees, Defraying out of Consolidated Fund, *July 18*, 334.
Revenue Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 327, 328.
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill—Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17*, 135, 136.
Statute Law Revision [Scotland] Bill, 3R., *July 17*, 160.
Wines, British, Use of Foreign Grape "must" in Manufacture of—Registration of Manufacturers, *July 18*, 327.

Hayti
Trade Report Presented, *July 19*, 343.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1287, 1288.

Hazelton, Mr. R. [Galway, N.]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1168.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Extradition Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 530.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 846, 851, 854, 864, 880.
Methylated Spirits, Mineralised Retail Sale of, Relaxation of Restrictions on, *July 18*, 329.
Midwives Act, 1902—Restrictions on Irish Midwives practising in England and the Colonies, etc., *July 24*, 1018, 1020, 1026, 1028.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 502, 504, 512, 513, 522–524.
Natal Native Rising
  Colonial Office, Responsibility of, *July 19*, 388.
  Imperial Government Liability for Expenditure on Military Operations, *July 19*, 413.
Revenue Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 328–330.
Tobacco, Importation of, New Regulations as to, *July 18*, 328, 329.
Wines, British, Use of Foreign Grape "must" in Manufacture of—Registration of Manufacturers, *July 18*, 329, 330.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
India, Telegraph Service—Charges from England to India, Reduction of, proposed, *July 20*, 601.
India Office, Salary of Secretary of State, Placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20th*, 600.

Hedges, Mr. A. J. [Kent, Tonbridge]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 222; *Con.*, *July 24*, 1137, 1138.

Helmsley, Lord [Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1159, 1162.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 267, 296; *Con.*, *July 23*, 766; *July 24*, 1133.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
Menston Lunatic Asylum Patients, Complaints as to Treatment of, *July 19*, 393.
Woolwich Arsenal Officials recently Appointed, Cost of, Number of Discharges, etc., *July 23*, 705.

Henderson, Mr. J. McD. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Public Trustee Bill, Liabilities Incurred by Public Trustees, Defraying out of Consolidated Fund, *July 18*, 335, 336.

Herbert, Col. [Monmouthshire, S.]
Crumlin Railway Level Crossing, Danger of, *July 23*, 729.

Herrings
Close Time for, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 26*, 1470, 1471.

Hervey, Capt. F. W. F. [Bury St. Edmunds]
Militia, Norfolk Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 25.

Hills, Mr. J. W. [Durham]
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 153, 160.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hampshire, New Forest]
Army General Staff, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 377.
South African War Remount Department Administration, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 19*, 378.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
Army
Guards, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 476, 477, 497, 498.
Personnel, Reduction Proposals, *July 19*, 474–478.
Reorganisation Proposals, Army Council Opinion of, *July 19*, 477.
Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Estates, Licensed Premises on, *July 17*, 17, 35.
Sunday Sale of Drink, Attitude towards, *July 17*, 36.
Petroleum Importation—Powers of Thames Conservancy Board to Control Movement from Landing Place, *July 18*, 181.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
Curaheen Postal Facilities, Improvement of, Proposed, *July 23*, 698.
Gortregan Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 26*, 1473.

Hollesley Bay
Labour Colony, Results of Experiment and proposals as to Continuance of.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 424, 461, 462.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.

Housing of the Working Classes
Acquisition of Land by Local Authorities for rural and urban Housing Schemes, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Ward, *July 19*, 452.
Applications received from Parish and District Councils—Return Presented, *July 26*, 1410.

Huddersfield Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne.]
Newcastle-on-Tyne, King's Visit to—alleged Hardships inflicted on certain Volunteers by Employers, *July 26*, 1427.

Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Hull Joint Dock Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Humber Conservancy Commission
Report Presented, *July 17*, 16, *July 19*, 343.

Humble Estate
Sale of, Advance for, in 1895—Date of Inquiry into Claims of Evicted Tenants etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Shee; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 363, 364.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.* *July 25*, 1225.

Hyde, Mr. C. G. [Wednesbury.]
Railway Companies, New, Rate of interest paid by, during Construction, *July 19*, 375.

Improvement of Landed Property Act, 1847
Loans issued under, effect on Rents, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1202.

Income Tax
Collection—Sums Collected at end of Financial year, Procedure as to.
Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 723.
Commissioners
Extra Work, Proposals as to Additional pay for.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 325; Mr. V. Cavendish, 326; Mr. C. Hay, 323.

[*cont.*

Income Tax—*cont.*

Committee, Extension of Terms of Reference of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 24,* 1022, 1023.

Monetary Prizes competed for in Public Services, Liability of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23,* 724.

India

Administrative Policy of the Government.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 20,* 595, 596; Mr. J. H. Roberts, 598–600; Mr. Rees, 602–608; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 610; Sir H. Fowler, 611, 614–616; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 622.

Army

Disease during last ten years—Return ordered, *July 24,* 1015.

Drafts for in 1904 and 1905.
Q. Lord Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18,* 172.

Expenditure

Effect of New Redistribution Scheme, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19,* 380.

Increase in.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20,* 582; Sir H. Cotton, 628; Mr. O'Grady, 634.

Guns, Proportion of, to men.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 367.

Medical Service — Specialists appointed.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Ellis, *July 25,* 1188.

Mountain Batteries, Proposals as to.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19,* 377.

Reorganisation Scheme of Lord Kitchener, Cost of, etc.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20,* 583; Sir H. Cotton, 630, 631.

Strength of.

Increase in.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20,* 582; Sir H. Cotton, 630, 631.

Necessity for Maintaining.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 20,* 593, 594; Mr. Rees, 608.

Standard of, Variation of since time of the Mutiny.
Os. Sir H. Cotton, *July 20,* 628–630.

Baroda, Poppy Cultivation in.
Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19,* 382.

India—*cont.*

Bengal

"Black-book"—Alleged Proposal to publish in connection with Anti-partition Movement.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19,* 383.

Newspapers—Measures taken to ascertain Subscribers' Names.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 26,* 1439.

Partition of

Local Opinion, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19,* 381.

Opportunity for discussing.
Qs. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26,* 1476, 1477.

Bombay—Colaba Church, use of, for Presbyterian Services for Troops.
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 23,* 683, 684.

Budget

Statement (Mr. Morley), *July 20,* 570–589.

Time given to Discussion of, in Calcutta, Proposals as to Increasing.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20,* 588; Earl Percy, 590.

Civil Servants, Privilege Leave Pay of—Authorising Payment in England, proposed.
Q. Mr. Courthorpe; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 20,* 569.

Condition and Progress, Material and Moral.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20,* 579, 580, 584–586; Mr. K. Hardie 596, 597; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 609; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 623, 624; Mr. O'Grady, 633, 634.

Cotton Industry in, Encouragement and Development of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 20,* 607.

Delhi, Cocaine Consumption in.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19,* 379.

Education

Primary, Condition of, Necessity for betterment of.
Os. Sir C. Schwann, *July 20,* 619, 620, 621; Mr. O'Grady, 636, 637.

Secondary Schools, Inadequate Number of.
Os. Sir C. Schwann, *July 20,* 620.

Famine Relief, Statistics as to.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 20,* 596, 597; Mr. Rees, 603; Mr. O'Grady, 634.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Finance

Amendments to Financial Proposals of Viceroy, Question as to allowing.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 588.

Budget, *see that subheading.*

Debt, Total Permanent, Condition of.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 578, 579.

Revenue and Expenditure for 1904–5, and 1905–6.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 575, 576.
Resolution [Mr. Morley], *July 20*, 637.

Statement [Mr. Morley], *July 20*, 575–583.

Financial Prosperity of.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 20*, 590, 591.

Fiscal Question, Relations towards.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 580, 581, 582, Earl Percy, 591, 592.

Forestry, Progress made with, and Revenues derived from.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 578.

Gold Standard Reserve, Amount of, Proportion of Silver, etc.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 26*, 1439, 1440.

Irrigation Works—Progress made with, and Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 578; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 609; Mr. O'Grady, 634.

Land, Revenue derived from.
Os. Sir H. Fowler, *July 20*, 612, 613; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 624, 625.

Legislative Council, Proposals as to Extension of Representative Element in.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 588, 590; Earl Percy, 590.

Central Provinces, Representation of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 23*, 681.

Legislative Councils Reform Committee, Constitution of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 26*, 1443, 1444.

Madras Presidency Liquor Traffic Regulations—Additional Shops opened for Sale of Imported Liquors, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19*, 375, 376.

Mortality Rate, alleged Increase in.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 20*, 596; Mr. Rees, 603; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 609; Sir H. Fowler, 613; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 623; Mr. O'Grady, 635.

Native States under Control of Political Agents.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. J. Ellis, *July 24*, 1034.

India—*cont.*

Natives, Question as to Employment of, in higher Administrative Posts.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 588, 589; Earl Percy, 590; Mr. K. Hardie, 596, 597; Mr. J. H. Roberts, 599; Mr. Rees, 602; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 627.

Nizam's Territory, Importation of Opium into.
Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19*, 382.

North-West Frontier—Troops required for Defence of.
Os. Lord Grimthorpe, *July 24*, 989.

Opium

Sales for Export (1901–1907).
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 17*, 21, 22.

Trade, Revenue derived from.
Os. Sir W. Evans-Gordon, *July 20*, 625, 626.

Penal Code, Inquiry into working of, proposed.
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 724.

Policy—*Statement* [Mr. Morley], *June 20*, 570–574, 584–589.

Political Agitation in, fostered from Home sources.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 20*, 604–608.

Poppy Cultivation, Area Licensed for—Proposals for Reduction.
Qs. Mr. T. Taylor, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 17*, 26.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19*, 383.

Railways

Revenue derived from, Increase in.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 576, 577; Earl Percy, 591.

Working and Development of.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 577.

Ryots, Indebtedness of, Measures of Alleviation, etc.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 20*, 593.

Salt Tax

Amount of, etc.
Q. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19*, 381.

Reductions effected in.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 575, 576; Earl Percy, 591; Mr. Keir Hardie, 595; Sir H. Fowler, 612; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 626.

Taxation, Incidence of—Amount per Head of Population, etc.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 20*, 592; Sir H. Fowler, 611, 612.

Technological Institutions, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. O'Grady, *July 20*, 636.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Telegraph Service—Charges from England to India, Reduction of, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *July 20*, 601.
Textile Factories, Hours and Conditions of Employment in, State Supervision of, proposed.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *July 20*, 597.
Qs. Mr. T. Davies, Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 26*, 1444, 1445.
Tiger-Slaying Rewards—Differential Tariff proposed.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 19*, 379.
Trade
Export and Import, Statistics—Proportion to and from Free Trade States of the Far East, as compared with the Protective States of Europe.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 581; Earl Percy, 581, 591, 592; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 609; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 623, 624.
Statistics as to.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 579.

India Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.
Under-Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. E. Elis.
Salary of Secretary of State, Placing on the Estimates, proposed.
Os. Mr. Morley, *July 20*, 573, 574, 595; Mr. K. Hardie, 595–597; Mr. J. H. Roberts, 598, 599, 600; Mr. H. Heaton, 600; Mr. Rees, 602, 603, 604; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 608, 609; Sir H. Fowler, 615.

Indian Railways Act Amendment Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Inebriates Act 1898
Pauper Lunatics suffering from Effects of Alcohol, Application of Act to, proposed.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 700, 701.

Infectious Disease (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R., *July 24*, 1176.

Inland Revenue
Accounts, Bank at which kept.
Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 723, 724.
Supervisors—Examination Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 19*, 373.

Invergordon
Naval Base, Proposals as to establishing.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 705.

Ireland
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. Bryce.
Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.
Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.
See also Names of Places.
Administration of, Policy of Chief Secretary, etc.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *July 26*, 1521–1525; Colonel Saunderson, 1525–1533; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1535; Mr. Barrie, 1536; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1540, 1541; Mr. Bryce, 1546, 1549; Mr. Long, 1549, 1550.
Boycotting, Intimidation, Malicious Damage, etc.—Cases Reported to Police in 1906.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 205.
Brehon Laws Commission, Work of—Translation of remaining Documents, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 678, 679.
Congested Districts
Commission of Inquiry
Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *July 23*, 649, 650; Marquess of Londonderry, 653–657; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 658, 659; Lord Denman, 660, 661; Lord Ashbourne, 661, 662; Earl of Mayo, 662; Earl of Crewe, 664–666; Marquess of Lansdowne, 668–670.
O'Kelly, Mr. Conor, Objections to Appointment of.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 23*, 655, 656; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 658; Earl of Mayo, 663, 664; Earl of Crewe, 667; Marquess of Lansdowne, 670.
Scope of.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *July 23*, 649; Marquess of Londonderry, 654; Lord Denman, 659; Earl of Crewe, 665; Marquess of Lansdowne, 668.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 212, 213; *July 25*, 1204.
Sittings, Arrangement for.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1216.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Congested Districts—*cont.*
Compulsory Acquisition of Land by the Board, Objections to.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *July 23*, 651, 652.
Cottage Industries, Encouragement of.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *July 23*, 653.
Grass Lands, Disposal of.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *July 23*, 652; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 658; Earl of Crewe, 667.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*
County District and Municipal Councils
Administrative Work of, alleged Interference of Local Government Board.
Os. Mr. Joyce, *July 26*, 1480–1486; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 1486–1493; Mr. Power, 1493, 1494; Mr. Cogan, 1496–1498; Mr. O'Dowd, 1499–1501; Mr. Bryce, 1506.
Memberships of, Removal of Disqualification, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *July 26*, 1492, 1493; Mr. Bryce, 1513.
Education, *see title* Education—Ireland.
Estimates, *see under* Supply.
Evictions
Date of, procedure in ascertaining.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1419.
Return of Notices Presented, *July 25*, 1178, *July 26*, 1370.
Land Act, Land Commission, Land Judges' Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*
Magistrates, *see under title* Magistrates and Justices of the Peace.
Royal Canal, Condition of—Appointment made on Board of Control, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 200.
Royal Commissions in, Criticisms on Constitution of.
Os. Mr. Barrie, *July 26*, 1536, 1537; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1538, 1539; Mr. Bryce, 1542, 1543.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 738, 739.
Royal University
Accounts Presented, *July 25*, 1178.
Royal Warrants amending Statutes Presented, *July 23*, 643, 673.
Tobacco Cultivation in, *see under* Tobacco.
Trade Statistics—Weekly Returns proposed.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 24*, 1054.

Irish Language
Objects and Effects of the Gaelic Movement.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *July 26*, 1523, 1524.
Teaching in Schools, proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Halpin, Mr. Lundon; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 408, 409.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill
c. Com. and *Rep.*, *July 17*, 147, 148.
3R.* *July 18*, 332.
l. 1R.* *July 19*, 344.

Italy
Trade Report Presented, *July 19*, 343; *July 24*, 898.

James of Hereford, Lord
Alkali, etc., Works Bill, 3R., *July 23*, 649.

Japan
Army, alleged increase of.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 369.
Trade Report Presented, *July 20*, 537.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburghshire]
Ceylon Pearl Fisheries—Machine for Extracting Pearls, Cost of and Result achieved by, *July 23*, 711.
India
Colaba Church, Use of, for Presbyterian Services for Troops, *July 23*, 683.
Penal Code, Inquiry into Working of, proposed, *July 23*, 724.

Jarrow-on-Tyne
Secondary School Fees.
Q. Mr. J. W. Taylor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 26*, 1464, 1465.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
"Montagu," H.M.S., Expenditure on salving, *July 24*, 1029.

Johnstown
Licensing Prosecution—Authority for Police occupation of Schoolhouse.
Qs. Mr. Meagher; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Speaker, *July 24*, 1049, 1050.

Joicey-Cecil, Lord J. [Lincolnshire, Stamford]
Army Reductions—Date of giving directions as to Disbandment, *July 19*, 367.

Joint Stock Companies
Return Presented, *July 17*, 16.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Licensed Premises on Estates of, *July 17*, 35.
Sunday Sale of Drink, Attitude towards, *July 17*, 35.

Jones, Mr. L.—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con. July 24,* 1110, 1123; *July 25,* 1246–1248.
Poor Law Children—Cost of Maintenance of, *July 24,* 1042.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvonshire, Arfon]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 17,* 107, 108.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Anthrax, Deaths from—Dealing with dangerous wool at port of entry, pro posed, *July 24,* 1041.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Limerick Municipal Council, interference with administrative work of, by Local Government Board, *July 26,* 1480–1485.
Local Government Board
  Constitution and Work of, *July 26,* 1479, 1480.
  Public Bodies Order—Opposition of Local Authorities to, *July 26,* 1481, 1483.
Magistrates, Fees on Appointment of, *July 25,* 1218.

Justices of the Peace (No. 2) Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 26,* 1560.

Kanturk
Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement Claims of Mrs. A. Connell, J. Culhane, and T. Donovan.
  Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18,* 177, 178, 204, 205.
School, No. 1—Reason for Resignation of Mr. J. P. O'Connor.
  Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18,* 177.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Companies—Penalties for not Filing Returns, *July 25,* 1193, 1194.
Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con., July 24,* 1146.
Newcastle (Down) Foreshore, Board of Trade Control over, *July 26,* 1472, 1473.
Railways, Tube—Precautions against Fire, *July 25,* 1193.

Kekewich, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
Education
  Free Education, Right to Claim, *July 26,* 1464.
  Register of Teachers, Proposals as to Establishing, *July 19,* 371.

Kennaway, Sir J. H. [Devonshire, Honiton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con., July 23,* 782.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Arva—Police Assistance at Eviction of Mr. Mulligan, *July 25,* 1216.
Botanical and Zoological Gardens, Grants to, etc., *July 26,* 1468.
Cavan
  Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstating, *July 25,* 1200, 1201.
  Magistracy, Information as to, *July 25,* 1203.
  Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed, *July 25,* 1218.
Congested Districts Commission Sittings, Arrangements for, *July 25,* 1216.
Education of Afflicted Children, Proposals as to, *July 25,* 1218.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 26,* 1476.
Finlay Estate—Area of P. McGovern's Holding, *July 25,* 1182.
Lloyd Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. Reilly, *July 23,* 691.
Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Protests received against, *July 25,* 1200.
Monaghan Asylum—Alleged Wrongful Detention of F. McDonald, *July 26,* 1420.
Queen's County Special Court—Case of J. Starkie, *July 25,* 1200.
Railways, Irish—Grant paid for Acceleration of Passenger Trains, *July 26,* 1474.
Sankey Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. P. McTaggart, *July 23,* 690.

Kent Electric Power Bill
c. *Con.* July 23,* 671.
3R.* *July 26,* 1408.

Kettering Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 534.

Kew Gardens
Painting Work, Wages paid for.
  Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 26,* 1467.
Workers' Memorial, Reply to.
  Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 24,* 1045.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Evicted Tenants, Cause of Delay in Reinstating, *July 18,* 212.
Land Commission—Previous Occupation of Mr. Wilkinson, *July 18,* 204.

Kilkeasy
Church Temporalities owned by Land Commission—Tenants' Agreements for Purchase, etc.
  Qs. Mr. O'Mara; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18,* 210, 211.

Kilkenny
- St. John's Bridge, Legislation to Facilitate Rebuilding of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 205, 206.

Kilmallock
- Labourers' Cottages Scheme Expenses, Amount and Allocation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 207.

Kinder Reservoir
- Stoppage of Works, Reason for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ward; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 19*, 401, 402.

Kingston Estate
- Sale Proposals for—Date of Inquiry, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 357.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *July 26*, 1369.

Kinvara
- Harbour Improvements, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1414.

Labourers Cottages, Ireland
- *For* particular places *see their names.*
- Farmers' Servant Men, Extension of Act to, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1201.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* Report from Standing Committee on Law, *July 17*, 40.
  - *Con.*, *July 23*, 835.
  - 3R.* *July 23*, 895.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 24*, 899.
- Arbitrators, Remuneration, etc., of.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 208.
- *Debate on Consideration* [Commons], *July 23*, 835.
  - Admission of any labourer whatsoever to benefits under the Act, proposed, 885, 886.
  - Appeal to Judicial Tribunal, Objections to Removal of Rights as to, 857–864.
  - Application of Act to Improvement Schemes originated, but pending, 841, 842.
  - Architects, Engineers, Clerks of the Works, etc., Qualifications for Employment to be given to District Councils, 835–837.
  - Clause 11—Insertion of words "Unless the Court shall otherwise order" at end of, proposed, 869–871.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate on Consideration* [Commons]—*cont.*
  - Clause 18, Elimination of, proposed, 874–882.
  - Cottages, Exchequer Grant for Erection of—Residue to be divided between Rural Districts in proportion to number of Cottages provided before the Act, 874–882.
  - Direct Labour at Standard Rate, Power of District Councils to Employ, 854, 855.
  - Fees, Amount of, to be fixed by Lord Chancellor, Vice-President of Local Government Board, and President of Law Society in Ireland, proposed, 887, 888.
  - Fisherman, Inclusion of, in the Bill, proposed, 888–892.
  - Government Amendments, 884, 886, 887, 888.
  - "Including any Agricultural Labourers by whom or on whose behalf Representations have been made"—Insertion of Words in page 2, line 20, 855, 856.
  - Inspector, holding Inquiry as to Improvement Scheme, to have power to decide as to Compensations, proposed, 852, 854.
  - Labour Commissioners, Granting Power to Exercise Powers and Duties of Local Government Board to, proposed 839–841.
  - Land, Acquisition of, Extension of Powers of District Councils as to, proposed, 854.
    - Parcels of Land allotted to Labourers, no limitation as to Size to be placed on, proposed, 837–839.
  - Loans, Outstanding at passing of the Act—Facilitating Borrowings for Repayment of, proposed, 871–874.
  - Period for making Inquiries as to Schemes, Removal of Limitation as to, proposed, 856, 857.
  - "Public Road," in Section 3 of Act of 1886, to be Deemed to include any road or Passage over which a right of way exists, 843–848, 850–852.
  - Repeal of Second Proviso in Section 16 of Act of 1885, 843.
  - Ten per cent. Compensation for Compulsory Sale, Retention of Principle of, proposed, 867, 868.
  - Turbary Rights, Granting to Labourers, being Tenants of Rural Districts Councils, proposed, 842, 843.
- Inquiries—Regulation as to Attendance of Medical Officers.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 209.

[*cont.*

Labourers (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
Proposals as to—Effect on Unemployment, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 428.
Provisions as to Repayment of Loans, making Retrospective, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 207.
Unionists of Ireland, Measure directed against, Alleged.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *July 26*, 1523.

Laidlaw, Mr. R. [Renfrew, E.]
Straits Settlements—Income derived from licensing Gambling Horses, etc., *July 26*, 1447.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Devon, S. Molton]
Bermuda Floating Dock—Date of Arrival, Occasions of using, etc., *July 23*, 705.
Invergordon, Proposals as to Naval Base at, *July 23*, 705.
"Montagu," Expenditure on Salving, *July 19*, 379.

Lambert Minors Estate
Police Visits to Tenants, Alleged.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 376.
Sale of—Untenanted Land available, etc.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1423, 1424.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
Trawlers, Foreign, in Prohibited Waters—Decision of Sheriff Guthrie, *July 25*, 1198.

Lamphiere Estate
Police on Special Duty at, Relations with People, etc.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1208, 1209.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 535.
3R.* *July 24*, 897.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 17*, 4.
Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Land Commission, Ireland
[*For* particular Estates, *see their names.*]
Commissioners, Temporary Assistant, Reason for Dispensing with Services of.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *July 26*, 1522.
Postcard, Alleged Unauthorised use of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 208.
Wilkinson, Mr., Duties of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Meehan, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 203, 204.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Land Judge's Court
Estates over which Receivers have been appointed—Return Presented, *July 17*, 15.

Land Purchase, Ireland
See also names of Estates, etc.
Bank Receipts, Procedure in giving.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 703, 704.
Price—Valuation Standard, Decision in Blake-Forster Case, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 18*, 170.

Land Registry
Title, Compulsory Registration of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Napier; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 23*, 699.
Work done under Various Acts—Return Presented, *July 20*, 564.

Land Tax Acts
Commissioners
Emoluments of, Alleged Interference with.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *July 18*, 328.
List of Christian and Surnames of, ordered, *July 20*, 640.

Land Tax Commissioners Bill
c. 2R., *July 20*, 639.

Land Tenure (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 23*, 741.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks., W.R., Barkston Ash]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 92; *July 18*, 265, 266, 283, 290, 295; *Con.*, *July 24*, 1113, 1124, 1135; *July 25*, 1259–1261, 1277.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Army
Artillery
Conservative Government Policy as to, *July 24*, 1001–1003.
Importance of, Necessity for Maintaining full Strength in Men and Guns, etc., *July 24*, 1001–1004.
Reorganisation of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1001–1005.
Terms of Service in, Alteration of, *July 24*. 1003.
Auxiliary Forces, Reorganisation of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1004, 1005.
Guards, Proposals as to Reduction in, *July 24*, 1000, 1001.

[*cont*

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*cont.*
  Army—*cont.*
    Personnel, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 998–1001, 1005, 1006.
    Reorganisation Proposals, *July 24*, 998–1006.
      Army Council, Opinion of, *July 24*, 999.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, Proposals as to, in House of Lords, *July 20*, 537, 538.
  Irish Congested Districts—Commission of Inquiry
    Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc., *July 23*, 668–670.
    Scope of, *July 23*, 668.
  Militia—Foreign Service, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1004.

Laundries
  Inspection of
    Extension of Factories Acts, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 728.
    Names mentioned in Reports, Rule as to not divulging.
      Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 727.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
  Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1148.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
  Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1167.

Law Courts
  Ireland—King's Bench Division, Cases tried in during June and July.
    Q. Sir E. Carston; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 26*, 1474.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
  Army
    Canteens, System of Supplying—Case of Messrs. R. Dickeson & Co., *July 23*, 708, 709.
    Civil Employment of ex-Soldiers, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 173.
    Jordan, Case of—Reason for Reinstatement as Quartermaster-Sergeant, *July 18*, 176.
    Reduction, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 708.

Leamington Spa
  Shop Hours Act, Order made under, Presented, *July 20*, 537, 564.

Leather
  Adulteration of—Complaints as to American Leather, etc.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 396.

Leckhampton
  Right of Way Disturbances—Sentences inflicted, etc.
    Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 726.
    Qs. Mr. Essex; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 1191, 1192.
    Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1457, 1458.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]
  "Montagu," H.M.S., Expenditure on Salving, *July 24*, 1029.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
  Army—Reductions, Proposals as to, *July* 18, 173.
  Transvaal
    Chinese Labour Repatriation, Petition of Miners against, *July 23*, 713.
    Kaffir Recruiting Licences, Delay in issue of, *July 17*, 31.

Lewis, Mr. J. H.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Flintshire]
  Land Tax Commissioners Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 639, 640.

Lewis, Island of
  Fisheries—Provision of Hauling Winches for Boats, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 24*, 1046.
  Migration of Cottars to Mainland, Arrangements for.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 25*, 1196, 1197.
  Sanitary Condition, Proposals for Improvement of.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 18*, 199.
    Visit of Secretary proposed.
      Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *July 25*, 1197.
  Water Supply in Schools, Proposals for improving.
    Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 26*, 1470.

Liddell, Mr. H. [Down, W.]
  Cabinet Ministers, Authority for issuing Traffic passes to, *July 26*, 1462.
  Vaccination of Pupil Teachers, Regulations as to, *July 19*, 405.

Lights and Lighthouses
  Owers Light Ship, Position of—Alleged Detriment to Selsey Fishing Industry, etc.
    Q. Lord E. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 398, 399.

Limerick

Evicted Tenants, Delay in reinstating.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 212.

Municipal Council, Interference with Administrative Work of, by Local Government Board.
Os. Mr. Joyce, *July 26*, 1480–1485.

Summer Assizes—Authority for Military Guard of Honour.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1443.

Liquor Traffic

Revenue derived from in 1898–9 and 1905–6.
Qs. Mr. C. Roberts; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 19*, 404, 405.

Lismore

Salmon Weir—Legality of Closing Dummy Hatches during Weekly Close Time.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 17*, 23.

Lisnalong

Postmaster—Attendance at Orange Society Meeting alleged.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1434, 1435.

Liverpool

Customs Transhipment Regulations.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 163, 164.

Telegraph Office
Press Messages, Alleged Delay in.
Qs. Mr. W. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1466.

Promotions in.
Qs. Mr. W. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1466, 1467.

Liverpool, Earl of

Parliament, Houses of—Unfinished Condition of Rooms, Appropriated to Services of the House, etc.—Appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry, *July 19*, 346.

Physical Energy Statue—Decision as to site for Erection of, *July 26*, 1407, 1408.

Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Society

Limited Liability Company, Power to Turn into.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 24*, 1044, 1045.

Lloyd Estate

Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. Reilly.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 691.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon, etc.]

Bills, Private—Number of Reports of Board of Trade Furnished to Unopposed Bill Committee, *July 19*, 399.

Crumlin Railway Level Crossing, Danger of, *July 23*, 729.

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R. *July 25*, 1356.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 50–56, 61, 66, 67, 68, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 86, 100, 104–106, 113, 114, 117, *Con.*, *July 23*, 750–752.

Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1149, 1150.

Irish Trade Statistics—Weekly Returns proposed, *July 24*, 1054.

Merchant Seamen—Wages of—Charge for Remitting from Foreign Ports, *July 18*, 192.

New Zealand—Working of Preferentia System for British Goods, *July 18*, 194.

Owers Light Ship, Position of, *July 19*, 398, 399.

Railways
- Great Eastern Company — Alleged Disregard of Acts as to Private Sidings, *July 19*, 374.
- Ireland
  - Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway—Additional Trains and Better Accommodation, proposed, *July 19*, 410.
  - Great Northern
    - Inconvenience caused by Failure of Derry Train to Meet Steamer for Glasgow, *July 19*, 374.
    - Mail Trains, Reason for not Carrying Third Class Passengers on, *July 18*, 183.
- New Companies, Rate of Interest Paid by, During Construction, *July 19*, 375.

Roumanian Customs Duty on Mineral Waters, *July 19*, 356.

Sheffield Railway Accommodation, Complaints as to, *July 19*, 397.

Spain—Charge Against Engineer of "Gravina" at Valencia, *July 26*, 1430.

Torches, German, Importation and Trade-Marking of, *July 18*, 195.

Unemployed—Trade Union Reports for May, *July 19*, 373.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
Parliamentary Secretary.—Mr. W. Runciman.
Report (1904–5)—Supplement Presented, *July 25*, 1178; *July 26*, 1370.
Vote for, *July 19*, 419.

Local Government Board, Ireland
Account Forms, Objections to.
Os. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *July 26*, 1490, 1491.
Administrative Work of.
Os. Mr. Joyce, *July 26*, 1479; Mr. Nolan, 1501; Mr. Cullinan, 1504–1506; Mr. Bryce, 1506–1512; Mr. Long, 1516–1517; Mr. Ginnell, 1517–1519.
Audit of Accounts—Fees Recovered, Return Ordered, *July 24*, 1015.
Auditors, Qualifications of, etc.
Os. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *July 26*, 1489, 1490; Mr. Bryce, 1508.
Constitution of.
Os. Mr. Joyce, *July 26*, 1479; Mr. Bryce, 1508.
County, District, and Municipal Councils Alleged Interference with.
Os. Mr. Joyce, *July 26*, 1480–1486; Mr. J. P. Farrell, 1486–1493; Mr. Power, 1493, 1494; Mr. Cogan, 1496 – 1498; Mr. O'Dowd, 1499–1501; Mr. Bryce, 1506.
Officials, Return as to—Procedure in Supplying Information.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1213–1215.
Public Bodies Order—Opposition of Local Authorities to.
Os. Mr. Joyce, *July 26*, 1481, 1483; Mr. Cogan, 1495, 1496.
Report for 1905
Date of issuing.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 694.
Presented *July 25*, 1178; *July 26*, 1370.
Surcharges on Accounts of Local Bodies, Method of dealing with.
Os. Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1510–1512.
Vote for, *July 26*, 1479.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill
l. *Com.* July 26*, 1369.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of the Working Classes) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 342.
Com. July 20*, 536.
Rep. July 23*, 642.
3R.* *July 24*, 898.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
l. *Com.* July 17*, 3.
3R.* *July 19*, 342.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 23*, 671.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 17*, 2
Com. July 20*, 536.
Rep. July 23*, 642.
3R.* *July 24*, 898.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 342.
Com. July 20*, 536.
3R., *July 23*, 642.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. *Com.* July 17*, 3.
3R.* *July 20*, 536.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Bill
Objects of, Allegations as to.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, *July 26,* 1522, 1523.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Army—Guards Proposals as to Reduction, *July 19,* 497, 498.

London
Children, Employment of, *see that title.*

London, Brighton & South Coast Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 20,* 535.

London County Buildings Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 535.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 20,* 562.

London County Council (Money) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 24,* 897.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 20,* 536.

London Government Schemes (London and Penge, &c.) Bill
*l. Com.** *July 17,* 3.
3R.* *July 20,* 536.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 534.

London and South Western Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 535.

London Squares and Enclosures Bill
c. 2R.* *July 25,* 1177.

London United Tramways Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 20,* 562.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Congested Districts (Ireland)—Scope of Commission, *July 23,* 654.

Long, Col. C. W. [Worcestershire, Evesham]
Army Reserve—Transfers under new System, *July 23,* 695.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Administration of Ireland—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26,* 1549, 1550.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23,* 846, 857, 862.
Local Government Board, Ireland—Administrative work of, *July 26,* 1516, 1517.

Long, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
Unemployed—Farm and Labour Colonies, Experiments with, *July 19,* 436, 437.
Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905
Administration of—Working of Distress Committees, Number of Applicants, Number relieved, etc. *July 19,* 434–438.
Amendment of—Government Proposals as to, *July 19,* 438.
Defects in, and Alleged Failure of, *July 19,* 434–438.
Vagrancy, Report of Committee on—Proposals as to dealing with Vagrants, etc., *July 19,* 437.

Longford
Land Purchase in.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25,* 1206.
Magistracy, Religion of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24,* 1050.
March Assizes—Case of J. McCann.
Q. Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24,* 1046.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
Administration of Ireland—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26,* 1521–1525.
Australian Local Naval Force, Proposals as to, *July 18,* 215.
Boycotting, etc., Cases reported to Police in 1906, *July 18,* 205.
Drumkeerin — Disturbances arising out of Boycott of C. Brady, *July 18,* 206.
Dublin Corporation
Charges of Corruption against—Inquiry proposed, *July 23,* 687.
Clerkships, Procedure in appointing to, *July 25,* 1211.
Dungannon—John Street new Schools, Expediting Building of, proposed, *July 26,* 1411.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 26,* 1476.
Gaelic Movement, Objects and Effects of, *July 26,* 1523, 1524.
Galway—Condition of County, *July 25,* 1212, 1213.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23,* 874–878, 880, 881.
Measure directed against Unionists of Ireland, *July 26,* 1523.
Land Commission — Temporary Assistant Commissioners Reasons for dispensing with Services of, *July 26,* 1522.
Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Bill, objects of, *July 26,* 1522, 1523.
Magistrates—Complaints made against Mr. P. J. O'Malley, *July 26,* 1412.

[*cont.*

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*

Moymore — Alleged Outrage against P. Casey *July, 25*, 1182.

New Zealand—Working of Preferential System for British Goods, *July 18*, 194.

Questions, Insinuations in, *July 25*, 1186

Roscrea

Ancient Castles, Preservation of, *July 25*, 1219.

Union Water Supply, Proposals for Improvement of, *July 25*, 1205.

Ryfield—Allegations of Mr. J. Dowd against Mr. T. Rorke, J.P., *July 25*, 1211.

Shannon Development Company, Grant to, etc., *July 25*, 1205.

Soudan—Evacuation of Bahr-el-Ghazal, *July 26*, 1454.

Uganda—Reports as to Native Unrest, *July 23*, 713.

Lord Advocate for Scotland

Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.

Lord Chamberlain

Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor

Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice

Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain

Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland

Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council

Earl of Crewe.

Lord Privy Seal

Marquess of Ripon.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill

c. *Rep.* July 17*, 13.
3R.* *July 20*, 563.

Lord Warden of the Duchy of Cornwall

Earl of Ducie.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor*

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1371.

Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1372.

Lough, Mr. T.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* (Islington, W.)

Civil Service Examiners serving under Board of Education, Power to transfer, *July 24*, 1044.

Lough, Mr. T.—*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 270, 272, 273, 276, 280, 281, 282, 285, 288, 294, 295, 296, *Con.*, *July 23*, 797, 798, 799, 800; *July 24*, 1104, 1107-1109, 1123; *July 25*, 1275, 1285.

Non-provided Schools continued as Private Schools—Teachers' Pension Rights, *July 19*, 406.

Religious Instruction, Payment of Expenses of, *July 19*, 406.

Wheathampstead School, Sanitary Condition of, *July 24*, 1043.

Loughrea

Ward, Mr. M., House of, *see under* Clanricarde Estate.

Lowe Estate

Sale of, Decision as to Lowestown, etc.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1416.

Lucan Estate

Pontoon Portion, Disposal of.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1442.

Lunacy

Asylums, Architect employed for altering and designing, etc.
Qs. Dr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Speaker, *July 26*, 1460, 1461.

Commissioners, Increase in Number of, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 1191.
Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1459.

Ireland

Pensions of Insane Soldiers, etc., in District Asylums, Deductions from.
Q. Mr. Cogan; *A.* Mr. M'Kenna, *July 17*, 38, 39.

Vote for, *July 26*, 1521.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill

c. Order for Second Reading read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 25*, 1368.

Protests received against.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1200.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]

Croker Estate—Reinstatement Claim of M. Power, *July 25*, 1209.

Dunraven Estates, Sale of, Reinstatements effected, etc., *July 23*, 684.

Education

Rule 127B, Abolition of, proposed, *July 23*, 684.

"Two-teacher" School, Definition of, *July 23*, 684.

Gascoigne Estate—Proposals as to Kilfinane portion, *July 26*, 1415.

[*cont.*

Lundon, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Irish Language, Proposals as to teaching in Schools, *July 19*, 409.
  Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 843.
  Lowe Estate, Sale of, *July 26*, 1416.
  Minshun (Frend) Estate untenanted Land, Disposal of, *July 26*, 1416.
  Mountshannon Estate, Purchase of—Reinstatements effected, etc., *July 26*, 1417.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1226, 1261, 1262, 1277, 1278.
  Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill, 3R., *July 18*, 334.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 503, 506, 511, 517.
  Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 155, 156, 158.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Amended Repatriation Notification, Date of posting up, *July 23*, 716.

Lynch, Mr. H. F. B. [Yorks, W. R., Ripon.]
  Opium Trade with China, proposals for Reform of, *July 17*, 27.
  Turkish Customs Duties, Decision as to, *July 23*, 721, 722; *July 24*, 1038; *July 26*, 1455.

Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
  Africa, South — Self-Government Commission Report, Date of Tabling *July 23*, 734, 735.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1238–1240.

McCalmont, Col. J. [Antrim, E.]
  Education — School Building Grants, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1413.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
  Volunteer Camp Training, Leave of Post Office Employees, *July 18*, 197.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 799.
  Natal Native Rising—Kula, Circumstances of Arrest of, *July 19*, 389.
  Poor Law Commission Report and Recommendations — Date of Presenting, *July 19*, 433, 434.
  Transvaal
    Bewaarplatzen, Disposal of, *July 23*, 718.
    Chinese Labour
      Corporal Punishment—Investigation of Cason Mine Case, *July 17*, 29, 30.
      Repatriation, Petition of Miners against, *July 23*, 713.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
  Unemployed
    Farm and Labour Colonies, Experiments with, *July 19*, 432, 433.
    Grant for, from Consolidated Fund, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 433.
    Relief Works, Objections to, *July 19*, 430.
    Women—Statistics as to, *July 19*, 432.
  Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, Administration of—Working of Distress Committees, Number of Applicants, Number Relieved, etc., *July 19*, 430.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Sligo, N.]
  Education Inspectors, Notification of Visits of, *July 23*, 690.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berks., Newbury]
  Transvaal, Chinese Labourers
    Crimes—Proposals for Protection of White People, *July 19*, 411.
    Desertions during May and June, *July 23*, 717.
    Murders by, during first Six Months of 1906, *July 23*, 717.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
  Anney Police Domiciliary Visits, Reason of *July 26*, 1441.
  Dromore Drainage Scheme, Report on, *July 26*, 1440.
  Lisnalong Postmaster—Alleged Attendance at Orange Society Meeting, *July 26*, 1434.
  Toomebridge Petty Sessions' Clerk, Avocations of, *July 26*, 1441.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Monmouth, N.]
  Alcohol
    Industrial use of, Legislation to Facilitate, *July 18*, 320–323.
    Surtax on Foreign Imported Alcohol, Removal of, *July 18*, 322.
  Anstruther Harbour Improvement, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1017.
  Botanical Gardens, Grants to, *July 26*, 1469.
  Canals Royal Commission, Constitution of —Irish Representation, etc., *July 26*, 1472.
  Civil Service
    Assistant Clerks, New Class, Salaries of, *July 18*, 183.
    Second Division Clerks desirous of Transfer, List of, proposed, *July 24*, 1020.
  Crown Lands Bill, 3R., *July 25*, 1368.

[*cont.*

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Customs and Excise
Examining Officers, Second Class, Allowances to and Promotions of, *July 18*, 165, 166.
Watchers, Customs Non-pensioner, Wages of, *July 19*, 355; *July 26*, 1438.
Deel River, Drainage of, proposed, *July 24*, 1052.
Dromore Drainage Scheme, Report on, *July 26*, 1440.
Dublin Government Offices, Temporary Clerkships in, *July 24*, 1019.
Dungannon—John Street new chools, Expediting building of, proposed, *July 26*, 1411.
Financial Return No. 190, Information as to, *July 18*, 215.
Income Tax Commissioners—Extra Work, Proposals as to Additional Pay for, *July 18*, 325.
Inland Revenue Supervisors—Examination Arrangements, *July 19*, 373.
Irish School Building Plans, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1052.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill *Com.*, *July 17*, 147.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 838, 854.
Liquor Traffic, Revenue derived from in 1898–9 and 1905–6, *July 19*, 405.
Liverpool Customs Transhipment Regulations, *July 18*, 164.
Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Society, Power to turn into Limited Liability Company, *July 24*, 1045.
Lunatic Soldiers, etc., in Irish District Asylums, Deduction from Pensions of, *July 17*, 39.
Methylated Spirits, Mineralised, Retail Sale of, Relaxation of Restriction on, *July 18*, 322, 323.
Railways, Ireland—Grant paid for Acceleration of Passenger Trains, *July 26*, 1474, 1475.
Regent Street Quadrant, Petition against rebuilding, *July 17*, 35.
Revenue Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 319.
Roscrea Ancient Castles, Preservation of, *July 25*, 1219.
Saccharine, Laws as to, Assimilation of, to that relating to Sugar, etc., *July 18*, 323.
Taxes, Surveyor of—Salaries and Holidays of Clerks, Result of Inquiry, etc., *July 20*, 567, 568; *July 26*, 1437–1439.
Tobacco, Importation of, New Regulations as to, *July 18*, 323.
Trade Union Rules, Registration of—Powers of Registrar as to Definition of Union, etc., *July 19*, 404.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Treasury Bills
Remuneration to Bank of England on total amount of Bills issued in the year, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 325.
Renewal of, Granting Discretionary Powers as to, to Chancellor of the Exchequer, *July 18*, 324, 325.
Urlingford—Drainage charge levied on the Loughens, *July 26*, 1419.
Wines, British, use of Foreign Grape "must" in Manufacture of—Registration of Manufacturers, *July 18*, 323, 324.
Zoological Gardens, Grants to, etc., *July 26*, 1469.

McKillop, Mr. W. [Armagh, S.]
Todd-Thornton Estate—Sale of Mullinune Meadows, *July 26*, 1424.

Maclean, Mr. D. [Bath]
Water Supply and Afforestation, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 25*, 1194.

McMicking, Major G. [Kirkcudbrightshire]
Army Reductions—Effect on Royal Field Artillery, *July 18*, 176.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
Education, Training Colleges, Abolition of Denominationalism in proposed, *July 23*, 730–731.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 224, 237–239, 263–265, 282, 286, 287; *Con.*, *July 23*, 748, 774–777, 822–825; *July 24*, 1065, 1066, 1113, 1131; *July 25*, 1225.
Act of 1870, Re-enactment of Section 87, proposed, *July 26*, 1433.
Local Education Authorities Travelling Expenses, Payment of, proposed, *July 26*, 1433.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
Ardara Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 18*, 181.
Egypt—Attack on British Officers, Photographs of Execution of Sentences, Authority for Publishing, etc., *July 19*, 370.

Maconely Estate
Turbary Rights of Tenants.
Qs. Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1207, 1208.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
Cavan Magistracy, Information as to, *July 25*, 1203.
Dobson, Constabulary Sergeant, Charge against, *July 25*, 1215, 1216.
Dublin Corporation Clerkships, Procedure in Appointing to, *July 25*, 1211.

[*cont.*

MacVeagh, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Egypt
British garrison in—Furlough granted to General Bullock, etc., *July 19*, 367.
Cromer, Lord, and Sir M. McIlwraith' Leave of Absence granted to, *July 19*, 390.
Seresinah, Corpse of Native found near — Charge against British Soldier, etc., *July 19*, 391.
Fowney—Malicious Outrages on Property of Mr. R. Bailey, Police Efforts to trace Offenders, etc., *July 26*, 1424.
Great Northern (Ireland) Railway
Inconvenience Caused by Failure of Derry Train to meet Steamer for Glasgow, etc., *July 19*, 374.
Mail Trains, Reason for not Carrying Third Class Passengers on, *July 18*, 183.
Local Government Board Officials—Information Supplied in Return, *July 25*, 1213, 1214.
Magherafelt Postman, Connection of, with Orange Processions, etc., *July 26*, 1436.
Malta Protestant Mission Services, Reason for Prohibiting, *July 19*, 385.
Newcastle Foreshore, Board of Trade Control over, *July 26*, 1472, 1473.
Shimla River Fishing Regulations, Enforcement of, *July 18*, 214.
Stanstead Tuberculosis ExperimentalFarm, Expenditure on and Work Done by, *July 26*, 1432.
Taxation—Surveyors' Clerks, Grievances of, *July 26*, 1437, 1439.
Torches, German, Importation and Trade Marking of, *July 18*, 195.
Yeomanry in the North of Ireland—Pay during Training, *July 25*, 1186.

Macclesfield and District Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *July 26*, 1369.

Macedonia
Greek Bands, Incursions of—Representations to Greek Government, proposed.
Os. Lord Newton, *July 20*, 346–349; Lord Fitzmaurice, 349–351.

Madagascar
Trade Report, Presented, *July 19*, 343.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1357, 1358.

Magherafelt
Postman, Connection of, with Orange Processions, etc.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1436.

Magistrates, Ireland
Appointments made (1902–1906).
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 203.
Fees on Appointment.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 25*, 1217, 1218.
O'Malley, Mr. P. J., Complaints made against.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1412, 1413.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Education [England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 238; *Con.*, *July 23*, 811–813; *July 25*, 1289–1290.

Malone Estate
Farms, Disposal of.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1204, 1205.
Purchase of, Disposal of Lands, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 201.

Malta
Funeral Processions, Regulations as to Chaplains in Vestments occompanying —Alleged Order against Protestants, etc.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 26*, 1445–1447.
Garrison, Proposed Reduction of.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 24*, 941, 945; Lord Tweedmouth, 974; Viscount Goschen, 986; Lord Grimthorpe, 986.
Protestant Services in Theatre, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. A. Taylor; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 19*, 384.
Correspondence, Proposals as to Tabling.
Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 716, 717.
Religious Processions, Regulations as to—Date of Tabling Correspondence, etc.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Boland, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr.Churchill, *July 19*, 385, 386.

Manchester
Police, Charges against—Investigation proposed.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 371.

Manchester Churches Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Manchester Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Manchuria
British Trade Interests, Protection of—Date of opening Port of Dalny, etc.
Q. Mr. Cawley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 393.

Mansfield, Mr. H. R. [Lincoln, Spalding]
Army
Horses, Age for Purchase of, *July 18*, 171.
Pensions, Weekly Payment of, proposed, *July 17*, 24.
Vaccination Exemption Certificates, Power of Magistrate to grant to Applicants residing outside his Jurisdiction, *July 18*, 193.
Wheathampstead School, Sanitary Condition of, *July 24*, 1043.

Marine Insurance Bill
c. Con., July 26, 1557.
3R.* *July 26*, 1560.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1161.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con., July 19*, 518.
Postage Stamps, Facilities for buying at Railway Stations, *July 18*, 197.

Marlborough
Death of Man from Meningitis—Action of Police and Poor Law Officers, etc.
Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 19*, 400.

Marriage Act Amendment Bill
l. 1R.* *July 24*, 899.

Marriage with Foreigners Bill
c. 2R., *July 18*, 339.
Com., July 19, 525.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 19*, 529.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 537.

Married Women's Property Bill
c. 1R.* *July 25*, 1221.

Maryport Harbour Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Masterman, Mr. C. F. G. [West Ham, N.]
Customs Examining Officers, Second Class, Allowances to and Promotions of, *July 18*, 164, 165.
Customs Non-pensioner Watchers, Wages of, *July 19*, 355.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con., July 25*, 1242–1244.
Ockenden, Labour Colony at—Results of Experiments and Proposals as to Continuance of, *July 19*, 440.
Unemployed
Grant for, from Consolidated Fund, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 439, 440.
Relief Works, Objections to, *July 19*, 439.

Mayo, Earl of
Congested Districts, Commission of Inquiry, Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc., *July 23*, 662.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
Evictions—Date of, Procedure in ascertaining, *July 26*, 1419.
Johnstown Licensing Prosecution—Authority for Police Occupation of Schoolhouse, *July 24*, 1049, 1050.
Urlingford—Drainage Charge levied on the Longhens, *July 26*, 1419.

Meath, Earl of
Army—*Personnel*, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 952.
Military Training of Youths, Necessity for—Extension of Cadet Corps System, etc., *July 24*, 952–956.
Tobacco Growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 11.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's County, Leix]
Land Commissioner Wilkinson, Duties, etc., of, *July 18*, 203.
Magistrates—Appointments in Ireland (1902–1906), *July 18*, 203.
Queen's County, Crimelessness of, Alleged—Revocation of Proclamation, proposed, *July 25*, 1198, 1200.

Menston
Lunatic Asylum Patients, Complaints as to Treatment of.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 393, 394.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanark, S.]
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill—Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17*, 127–130.

Merchant Shipping
[For particular Vessels, *see their names.*]
Annual Statement, Presented, *July 24*, 898, 1014.

Capture of Vessels at Sea, in time of War, Question of National Indemnity
Avoidance of Capture—Mercantile War-courses at Seaports for purposes of Instruction in.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 23*, 644–647; Lord Tweedmouth, 648.
Committee of Inquiry into—Retaining Services of Naval Member until Completion of Report.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 23*, 644; and Lord Tweedmouth, 647.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Madras Presidency Liquor Traffic Regulations, *July 19*, 376.
Natives, Question as to Employment of, in higher administrative posts, *July 20*, 588, 589.
Nizam's Territory, Importation of Opium into, *July 19*, 382.
Opium trade.
  China and Burmah—Reform proposals, *July 17*, 27, 28.
  Statistics 1901–1907, *July 17*, 22.
Policy—Statement, *July 20*, 570–574, 584–589.
Poppy Cultivation, Area Licensed for, *July 17*, 26; *July 19*, 383.
Railways
  Revenue derived from, Increase in, *July 20*, 576, 577.
  Working and Development of, *July 20*, 577.
Salary of Secretary of State, placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20*, 573, 574, 595.
Salt Tax
  Amount of, etc., *July 19*, 381.
  Reductions Effected in, *July 20*, 575, 576.
Textile Factories, Hours of Labour in, *July 26*, 1445.
Tibet Agreement—Date of Tabling Papers, *July 18*, 171; *July 26*, 1444.
Tiger-slaying—Differential Tariff for Rewards, proposed, *July 19*, 379.
Trade
  Export and Import Statistics—Proportion to and from Free Trade States of the Far East, as compared with the Protective States of Europe, *July 20*, 581.
  Statistics as to, *July 20*, 579.

Morocco
Land Sales to Foreigners—Procedure Necessary for rendering titles valid.
  Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 26*, 1453, 1454.
Police in Coast Towns, Powers of, to stop Slave Trading.
  Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 17*, 31.

Morpeth, Lord [Birmingham, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 251–253, 269, 271, 272, 274, 283; *Con.*, *July 23*, 796, 798, 799; *July 24*, 1082–1084, 1114, 1118.

Morrogh Bernard Estate
Sale Negotiations, Progress made with.
  Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 168.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland].
Crofters Act Amendment Bill, proposals as to, *July 23*, 736; *July 26*, 1475.
Education—Pupil Teachers, new Regulations as to, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 26*, 1478.
Extradition Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 531.
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1174.
Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1357.
India—Native States under Control of Political Agents, *July 24*, 1034.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 505, 514, 521, 525.
Natal Native Rising—Officers Commanding Native Levies, *July 19*, 390.
Perthshire Chief Constable, Report of burgh offences by, *July 26*, 1472.
Revenue Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 327, 331.
Scottish Estimates, proposals as to, *July 23*, 737.
South-Eastern and London and Chatham Railway Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 671.
Sutherlandshire Main Roads, Improvement of, proposed, *July 19*, 407; *July 24*, 1045.
Trawlers' Certificates Supervision Bill, proposals as to, *July 19*, 411, 412.
Treasury Bills, Balances at Bank of England, Securing Payment of Interest on, proposed, *July 18*, 327, 331.

Motors
Accidents from
  Licences, Power to Suspend or Cancel.
    Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1458, 1459.
  Metropolitan Area Statistics for June—Proposals for Protection of Public, etc.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 397.
  Monthly Returns, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 24*, 1040.
  Provincial Statistics for, May and June.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 394.
Licences suspended or cancelled during 1906.
  Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 726.
Offences connected with Driving—Return of Proceedings (1904–5) Presented, *July 17*, 4, 15.
Omnibuses
  Extra Emergency Brake under Control of Conductor, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Scarisbrick; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 196.

[*cont.*

Motors—*cont.*
Omnibuses—*cont.*
Licensing of, Procedure as to.
Os. Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, *July 20*, 549, 550.
Noise, Annoyance, and injury caused by, in London—Measures proposed in Mitigation of.
Os. Marquess of Granby, *July 20*, 539–544; Lord Teynham, 544, 545; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, 545–551.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 20*, 551; Earl Beauchamp, 551, 552; Earl Cawdor, 552, 553.
Powers of Local Government as to Control, etc.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 17*, 20.
Speed Limit in Metropolitan Area.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 180.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 729, 730.
Statistics as to Present and Future Number of, and Number of Passengers carried Daily.
Os. Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, *July 20*, 548, 549.
Petroleum Combustion, Noxious Odours caused by, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 725; *July 24*, 1040.
Royal Commission — Report Presented, *July 23*, 643, 673.
Speed of—Cabinet Ministers' Privileges, Issue of Passes, etc.
Qs. Sir F. Banbury, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 725, 726.
Taxing in proportion to Horse-Power, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 681.
Traction Engines, Nuisance caused by in London Streets, Restrictive measures, proposed.
Qs. Marquess of Granby, *July 20*, 543.

Mount Shannon Estate
Purchase of, Reinstatements Effected, etc.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1417.

Moymore
Casey, P., Alleged Firing at.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce; *July 25*, 1182.

Municipal Corporations Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
Education
National Schools Teachers' Civil Rights, Amendment of Rules as to, *July 18*, 168.
Primary, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 19*, 408.
Local Government Board Report for 1905, Date of issuing, *July 23*, 694.
Morrogh Bernard Estate Sale Negotiations, Progress made with, *July 18*, 168.
Poor Law Commission Report, Date of issuing, *July 23*, 693.
War Office Contracts—Tenders received from Hackford Provision Company, *July 18*, 184.

Musical Copyright Act 1902
Police employed under.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 739, 740.

Musical Copyright Bill
c. Con., *July 19*, 502.
Third Reading Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 739.

Muskerry, Lord
Merchant Shipping—Ex-Seamen, Employment of, in Government Departments, proposed, *July 20*, 553–556.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
" Native " Definition of, *July 23*, 716.

Napier, Mr. T. B. [Kent, Faversham]
Land Registry—Compulsory Registration of Title, proposed, *July 23*, 699.

Natal
Municipal Corporations Bill, Provisions of—Effect on *Status* of British Indians, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1428, 1429.
Native Rising
Arms and Ammunition used by Whites and Blacks.
Qs. Mr. Byles, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 19*, 387, 388.
Bambaata, Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of.
Qs. Mr. Dalziel, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 18*, 186–191.
Charges against Major Platt.
Qs. Mr. Meysey-Thompson, Mr. Arnold - Forster; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1448, 1449.

[cont.

Natal—*cont*
Native Rising—*cont.*
Bambaata, alleged Decapitation of—*cont*,
Officer Responsible for, Identity of.
Qs. Mr. Meysey-Thompson, Mr. Arnold - Forster; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1030, 1031.

Bishop of Zululand's Allegations against Colonel Royston's Column.
Q. Mr. Flynn *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 718, 719.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1447.

Conditions of Surrender offered to Natives.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 387.

Further Correspondence Presented, *July 23*, 643, 673.

Imperial Government Intervention, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Healy; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 19*, 413, 414.

Kula, Circumstances of Arrest of.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 19*, 389, 390.

Military Operations, Conduct of—British Government Representations, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Bottomley, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 714.

Inquiry proposed.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 720, 721.

Responsibility for.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1452, 1453.

Natives Killed, Wounded and Prisoners.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. J. Ward; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 185, 186.
Qs. Mr. Alden, Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 19*, 390.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1449.

Prisoners, Alleged Killing of, by Native Levies.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 186, 188, 190–192.

Navigation and Shipping
Annual Statement Presented, *July 24*, 898, 1014.

Navy—*First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth. *Financial Secretary* — Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

Bases, Defence of—Transfer to Admiralty, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 1477.

Battleships

Eight Battleships in Full Commission, etc., Cost of.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 23, 24.

Reconstruction of Vessels Launched Prior to, 1889.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 24.

Coal Consumption — Statistics as to Turbine Engines.
Q. Mr. C. Wilson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 18*, 166.

Dockyards

Devonport, Overtime Worked at.
Q. Sir J. Benn; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 371, 372.

Wages, Proposals as to.
Q. Sir J. Baker; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 18*, 166.

Expenditure

Appropriation Accounts, Referring to Committee, *July 19*, 532.

Principal Naval Powers, Statistics for During Last Ten Years—Return Ordered, *July 18*, 163.

Information to be Given in.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 1185.

Gun Reserve, Decision as to—Comparison with Foreign Navies, etc.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 24*, 1016.

Gunnery Practice in the North Sea—Alleged Waste of Ammunition by, Sheerness Reserve Division.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 18*, 184, 185.

"Montagu" Expenditure on Salving.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 19*, 378, 379.
Qs. Mr. H. Beach, Mr. A. Lee, Mr. Jenkins; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 24*, 1029.

Prize Money—Accounts Presented, *July 24*, 899, 1014.

Rosyth, Policy as to.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 26*, 1412.

Shipbuilding Programme of Foreign Nations, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Beauchamp; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 24*, 1017.

Navy Estimates

Savings and Deficiencies on Grants for 1904–5 — Committee to Consider.

Resolution (Mr. McKenna), *July 19*, 532.

Nelson

Shop Hours Act, Order Made under, Presented, *July 26*, 1370, 1410.

Nettlebed and District Commons Bill

c. *Rep.* July 23*, 671.

Newburgh and North Fife Railway (Extension of Time) Order Confirmation Bill

c. 1 and 2R.* *July 25*, 1177.

Con. July 26*, 1408.

New Zealand

Preferential Treatment for British Goods, Working of.

Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 18*, 194.

Newcastle (Down)

Foreshore, Board of Trade Control over.

Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Sloan; *As* Mr. Kearley, *July 26*, 1472, 1473.

Newcastle-on-Tyne

King and Queen's Visit to—Alleged Hardship Inflicted on Certain Volunteers by Employers, Question of Compensation, etc.

Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1427.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill

c. *Con.* July 19*, 352.
3R.* *July 23*, 671.

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.,* July 24*, 897.

Newport Corporation Bill

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 17*, 2.
Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Newton, Lord

Army

Personnel Reduction, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 977–979.

Re-organisation proposals, *July 24*, 975–983.

Macedonia, Greek Bands, Incursion of—Representations to Greek Government, proposed, *July 20*, 346–349.

Newtownards Urban District Council Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]

Dogs' Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1160.

Royal Commissions, Irish Constitution of, *July 23*, 738.

Transvaal Chinese Labour Repatriation—Superintendent of Foreign Labour, Duties of, *July 26*, 1445.

Nigeria

Chief Nana, Return of—Mode of Communicating to Authorities.

Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1448.

Cotton Cultivation, Labour Available for *Q.* Mr. Walker; *A.* Mr. Churchill *July 17*, 28, 29.

Railway Construction, Proposals as to

Q. Mr. Walker; *A.* Mr. Churchill *July 17*, 28.

Nolan, Mr. J. [Louth, S.]

Local Government Board, Administrative Work of, *July 26*, 1501.

Poor Law Medical Officers, Inadequate Number of, *July 26*, 1502.

North East London Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

North West London Railway Bill

l. Rep. July 20*, 535.

3R.* *July 26*, 1369.

North Sea

Scientific Investigations, Progress made with, etc.

Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 25*, 1220.

North and South Shields Electric Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Norwich

Telegraphic Delay in Transmission, from London, of Report of Mr. Haldane's, Speech, Alleged.

Q. Mr. Tillett; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23*, 677.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

O'Brien, Mr. K. E. [Tipperary, Mid.]

Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23* 841, 843.

Lamphiere Estate, Police on Special Duty at, etc., *July 25*, 1208.

Manchester Police, Charges against—Investigation, proposed, *July 19*, 371.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]

Kilkenny—St. John's Bridge, Legislation to Facilitate Re-building of, proposed, *July 18*, 205.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]
- Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 839.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas. [Wicklow, W.]
- Bristol Post Office—Duties of Messrs. Bicknell & Setter, *July 24*, 1016.
- Crimean War Pension of T. Loughlin, *July 23*, 696.
- Tinahely Post Office Medical Officer—Appointment of Dr. Bolster, *July 24*, 1053, 1054.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
- Administration of Ireland—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26*, 1540, 1541.
- Clanricarde Estate, Situation on, Case of Ward, etc., *July 26*, 1539, 1540.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 17*, 69, 70; *July 18*, 239, 240; *Con., July 24*, 1074–1078.
- Railway Commission, Constitution of, *July 26*, 1527, 1528.

O'Doherty, Mr. P. [Donegal, N.]
- Donegal Grand Jury, Alleged Exclusion of Catholics from, *July 26*, 1423.

O'Donnell, Mr. C. J. [Newington, Walworth]
- India—Partition of Bengal, Discussion of, etc., *July 26*, 1476.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]
- Ballinrobe
  - Canal, Completion of, proposed, *July 19*, 360.
  - Light Railway
    - Additional Trains and Better Accommodation, proposed, *July 19*, 410.
    - Guarantors—Representation on Board of Directors, *July 19*, 359.
- Clanmorris Estate, Sale of—Charges against Messrs. Good and Black, *July 19*, 362.
- Congested Districts Board—Mr. Vereker, Appointment, etc., of, *July 23*, 685, 686.
- Stoney Estate Grazing Lands, Disposal of, *July 19*, 358, 369.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
- Geevagh Sunday Band Practice, Alleged Police Interference with, *July 19*, 409.
- Local Government Board—Interference by, in Administrative Work of Local Authorities, *July 26*, 1499–1501.
- Magistrates, Fees on Appointment of, *July 25*, 1217.
- Owenmore River, Drainage Proposals, *July 19*, 407.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
- India
  - Army Expenditure, Increase in, *July 20*, 634.
  - Bengal, Partition of—Local Opinion, etc., *July 19*, 381.
  - Condition and Progress, Material and Moral, *July 20*, 633, 634.
  - Education, Primary, Condition of Necessity for Betterment of, *July 20*, 636, 637.
  - Famine Relief, Statistics as to, *July 20*, 634.
  - Irrigation Works, Progress made with, and Expenditure on, *July 20*, 634.
  - Mortality, Rate of, alleged Increase in, *July 20*, 635.
  - Technological Institutions, Establishment of, proposed, *July 20*, 636.

O'Hara, Mr. P. [Monaghan, N.]
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Con., July 19*, 515.

O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
- Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1167, 1173.
- Kilkenny—Tenants' Purchase Agreements for Church Temporalities owned by Land Commission, *July 18*, 210, 211.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
- Gould Verschoyle Estate, Sale of—Price asked, etc., *July 23*, 692.
- Kilmallock Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Expenses of, *July 18*, 207.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 843, 880.
  - Arbitrators, Remuneration of, *July 18*, 208.
  - Inquiries—Regulations as to Attendance of Medical Officers, *July 18*, 209.
  - Repayment of Loans—Making Provisions as to Retrospective, proposed, *July 18*, 207.
- Land Commission Post-card, Alleged Unauthorised Use of, *July 18*, 208.
- Limerick Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement of, *July 18*, 212.
- Rathkeale Post Office Premises, *July 23*, 734; *July 25*, 1219.
- Sands, Mrs., Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of J. Houlihan, *July 18*, 202, 203.
- Southwell Estate Evicted Tenants, Inquiries into Cases of, *July 25*, 1216.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
- Belfast Corporation Stock in Name of Deceased Person, Procedure in Selling, *July 23*, 704.
- Chearnley, Major, Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of J. Kearne, *July 23*, 629.

[*cont.*

O'Shee, Mr. J. J.—*cont.*

Humble Estate, Sale of, Advance for in 1895—Date of Inquiry into Claims of Evicted Tenants, etc., *July 19*, 363, 364.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 837, 839, 840, 854, 885, 886, 890.

Lismore Salmon Weir—Regulations as to Closing Dummy Hatches, *July 17*, 23.

National School Teachers—Examinations. Classification of Passes, *July 23*, 689.

Woodroffe and Parker Estates—Disposal of Untenanted Land, *July 19*, 364.

Ockenden

Labour Colony, Results of Experiment and Proposals as to Continuance of.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 424, 461; Mr. Masterman, 440.

Official Publications, &c.

Report from Select Committee, Presented, *July 23*, 740.

Open Spaces Bill

c. Con., July 19, 501.
3R.* *July 19*, 502.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 537.

Opium

Burmah, Sale Arrangements in.
Q. Mr. Baker; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 17*, 27, 28.

India, *see that title.*

Indo-Chinese trade, Proposals for Reform of.
Qs. Mr. Baker, Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 17*, 26, 27.

Revenue Farming System, Restrictions on in Straits Settlements, etc.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 19*, 388, 389.

Orange River Colony

Affairs—Further Correspondence Presented, *July 23*, 643, 672.

Oranmore and Browne, Lord

Congested Districts (Ireland)

Commission of Inquiry, Constitution of—Appointment of Members of Congested Districts Board, etc., *July 23*, 658, 659.

Grass Lands, Disposal of, *July 23*, 658.

Tobacco-growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 5–6, 12.

Owenmore River

Drainage, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 407.

Owers Light Ship

See under Lights and Lighthouses.

Paisley Gas & Water Provisional Order Bill

c. 2R.* *July 18*, 161.
*Con.** *July 19*, 352.
3R.* *July 20*, 563.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *July 20*, 536.

Paisley Roads Order Confirmation Bill

c. 1R. and 2R.* *July 26*, 1408.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]

Accrington—Decision as to Hyndburn Park School, *July 18*, 182.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con. July 23*, 805–807; *July 24*, 1072–1074.

Natal Native Rising—Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 18*, 186.

Volunteer Artillery, Proposals as to Disbanding, *July 18*, 184.

Parker Estate

Untenanted Land, Disposal of.
G. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19* 364, 365.

Parliament

House of Commons

Police Extra Duty, Payment for.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1456, 1457.

Refreshment Committee, System of Crockery Supply to.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 26*, 1430.

House of Lords

New Peers introduced

Armitstead of Castlehill, Baron, *July 23*, 641.

Courtney of Penwith, Baron, *July 19*, 341.

Eversley of Old Ford, Baron, *July 23*, 641.

Glantawe of Swansea, Baron, *July 23*, 641.

Pirrie of Belfast, Baron, *July 23*, 641.

Houses of

Frescoes — Further Memoranda by Professor Church, Presented, *July 23*, 643, 673.

Unfinished Condition of Rooms Appropriated to Service of the House, etc. — Appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry.
Os. Lord Stanmore, *July 19*, 344, 345; Earl of Plymouth, 346; Earl of Liverpool, 346.

Parliamentary Elections
  New Member Sworn—Mr. F. Freeman-Thomas, Cornwall (Bodmin Division), *July 26*, 1479.
  New Writ for Cumberland (Cockermouth Division), *July 23*, 740

Parliamentary Procedure
  Adjournment of the House, proposed
    Os. Sir E. Carson, Mr. G. Whiteley, *July 19*, 529.
  Autumn Session, Date of beginning.
    Os. Mr. V. Cavendish, Mr. B. Whiteley, *July 20*, 640.
  Chairman's Rulings, *see* Chairman.
  Speaker's Rulings, *see* Speaker.

Partington, Mr. O. [Derbyshire, High Peak]
  Education—Schools in which no Religious Instruction is given, *July 17*, 20.

Paul, Mr. H. W. [Northampton]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *July 24*, 1087, 1131; *July 25*, 1226–1228.

Pearce, Mr. R. [Staffordshire, Leek]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *July 24*, 1115, 1116.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 508.
  Public Trustee Bill—Liabilities incurred by Public Trustees, Defraying out of Consolidated Funds, *July 18*, 334.

Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
  India
    Army, Strength of, Necessity of Maintaining, *July 20*, 593, 594.
    Budget, Time given to Discussion of, in Calcutta, proposals as to increase of, *July 20*, 590.
    Financial Prosperity of, *July 20*, 590, 591.
    Fiscal Question, Relations towards, *July 20*, 591, 592.
    Legislative Council, Proposals as to Extension of Representative Element in, *July 20*, 590.
    Natives, Question as to Employment of, in higher Administrative Posts, *July 20*, 590.
    Railways, Revenue derived from, Increase in, *July 20*, 591.
    Ryots, Indebtedness of, Measures of Alleviation, etc., *July 20*, 593.
    Salt Tax, Reductions effected in, *July 20*, 591.
    Taxation, Incidence of, Amount per Head of Population, etc., *July 20*, 592.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
  India—*cont.*
    Trade, Export and Import Statistics — Proportion to and from Free Trade States of the Far East as compared with the Protective States of Europe, *July 20*, 581, 591, 592.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *July 25*, 1235–1238.

Perthshire
  Chief Constable, Report of Burgh Offences by
    Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *July 26*, 1472.

Peterborough Gas Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Petitions Committee, Public
  Special Report, Presented, *July 18*, 217.

Petroleum
  Importation—Powers of Thames Conservancy Board to control Movement from Landing Place.
    Q. Mr. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 181, 182.

Philipps, Lt.-Col. J. [Southampton]
  Hampstead and Victoria, Telephone Connection between, *July 26*, 1411.

"Physical Energy," Watts' Statue
  Site for Erection of, Decision as to
    Os. Earl of Plymouth, *July 26*, 1406, 1407; Earl of Liverpool, 1407, 1408.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *July 23*, 819–822.
  London County Council, Proposals as to New End and Deansfield Road Schools, *July 26*, 1434.
  Transvaal—Native Labour—Central African Natives, Mortality Returns (1905–6), *July 23*, 717.
  Unemployed Problem, Method of dealing with, *July 19*, 464.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Pirrie of Belfast, Baron
Introduced to House of Lords, *July 23*, 641.

Plymouth, Earl of
Parliament, Houses of—Unfinished condition of Rooms appropriated to Services of the House, etc.—Appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry, *July 19*, 346.
"Physical Energy" Statue—Decision as to site for erection of, *July 26*, 1406, 1407.

Poisons
Pharaoh's Serpents Eggs, composition and Restrictions on Sale of.
Q. Mr. Richardson; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 1192.

Police
Accidents, Monthly Returns of, throughout country, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. Gladstone, *July 24*, 1039, 1040.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*
Metropolitan
D'Angely case—Result of inquiries as to antecedents of Madame D'Angely.
Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; A. Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 395.
Inquiries by—Employment of men in plain clothes, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 193, 194.
Yiddish, Rewards for proficiency in.
Qs. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 19*, 394, 395.
Q. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 727.

Pontefract Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 342.

Poole Corporation Water Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 342.

Poor Law
Children
Boarding-out System
Ireland, Extension of system in, proposed.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 26*, 1503; Mr. Bryce, 1515.
Regulations as to, Revision of, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 464.
Cost of Maintenance under various systems.
Qs. Mr. L. Haslam, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 24*, 1041, 1042.

Poor Law—*cont.*
Children—*cont.*
"Scattered Homes" system, Extension of, proposed.
Os. Mr. G. A. Hardy, *July 19*, 459.
Commission Report and Recommendations—Date of Presenting.
Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 19*, 433, 434; Mr. J. Burns, 434
Os. Mr. Barrie, *July 26*, 1527, 1528.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 693.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1047, 1048.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1049.
Medical Officers
Inadequate number of.
Os. Mr. Nolan, *July 26*, 1502.
Vaccination, New Rules as to Proficiency in.
Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 213.
Number of paupers relieved in January and July 1906—Statement Presented, *July 19*, 354.
Relieving Officers, Women as, Reason for Objection to.
Q. Mr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 19*, 372,

Portarlington
Police force, Strength of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 17*, 37, 38; *July 24*, 1048, 1049.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*Under-Secretary for War*
Africa, South, Garrison in, Proposals as to, Reduction of, *July 24*, 945, 946.
Artillery
Militia Garrison, Utilising for Ammunition Column, *July 24*, 943, 944.
Reorganisation of, proposals as to, *July 24*, 943–945.
Strength of, *July 24*, 943, 944.
Defence of the Empire, Committee of Defence, Value of, *July 24*, 941.
Expeditionary force, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 942.
Expenditure, Reduction of, Necessity for, *July 24*, 939, 940.
Gibraltar Garrison, proposed reduction of, *July 24*, 941, 945.

[cont.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*cont.*
Guards
Cost of, compared with the Line, *July 24*, 947.
Reduction in, proposals as to, *July 24*, 946–948.
Malta Garrison, proposed Reduction of, *July 24*, 941, 945.
Militia, Foreign Service for, proposals as to, *July 24*, 948.
Personnel, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 939, 940, 945, 946.
Eight Battalions, *July 24*, 945.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 24*, 939–949

Portsmouth Water Bill
c. Con. July 17*, 13.
3R.* *July 20*, 563.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 23*, 642

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
[*For* particular Places *see their names.*]
Blind Persons, Postage on Literature for.
Q. Viscount Valentia; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 196.
Halfpenny Post—Business Documents, Returning free of Charge if not Delivered, proposed.
Q. Mr. Billson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 19*, 403.
Mail Bag Cloth, Contract for.
Q. Mr. Wilkie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 19*, 403.
Mail Service—Peninsular and Oriental Company, Apportionment of Subsidy paid to.
Q. Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 18.
Parcel Post—Foreign and Colonial Amendment (No. 20) Warrant Presented, *July 17*, 4, 15.
Penny Post, Universal—German Attitude towards Question.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 17.
Postmasters, Sub—Holiday Regulations.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 25*, 1181.
Postmen, Civil Rights of, in Regard to County Council Elections.
Q. Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23*, 676.
Retirement, Age for—Compulsory Retirement at Age of Sixty, proposed.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 167.
Sorters—Promotion System in South Western District Office.
Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 19*, 402.

Post Office—*cont.*
Stamps at Railway Stations, Facilities for buying.
Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 197.
Volunteer, Camp Training, Leave for.
Qs. Mr. McCrae; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 197.

Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 18*, 217.
2R.* *July 20*, 638.
Com., *July 25*, 1363.
Rep. and 3R.* *July 25*, 1365.
l. 1R., *July 26*, 1371.

Post Office Savings Bank
Unclaimed Balances, List of Depositors, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 1015, 1016.

Post Office Sites Bill
c. 3R., *July 17*, 142.
l. 1R., *July 19*, 344.
2R., *July 26*, 1371.

Postmaster General
Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 749, 750, 794; *July 24*, 1089; *July 25*, 1223–1225, 1254–1256.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Beresford Estate, Sale of—Inspector's Report, etc., *July 19*, 409; *July 26*, 1422.
Local Government Board, Administration of—Interference with Local Authorities, etc., *July 26*, 1493, 1494.
Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 738.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Preston
Post Office Staff, Proposals for Revision of
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 34.

Prevention of Corruption Bill
c. Con., *July 17*, 148.
3R.* *July 17*, 160.
l. Commons' Amendts, *Con.* July 26*, 1372.

Prisons
For particular Prisons *see names of places, etc.*]
Ireland
Luscombe and Lewis, Majors, and Mr. Boland, Information as to Appointments of.
Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1418.
Privileges earned by Industry, etc.—Order in Council Presented, *July 24*, 899, 1014.
Report Presented (1905–6), *July 26*, 1370, 1410.
Officers of Local Prisons, Scale of Pay of.
Qs. Mr. C. Hay; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 26*, 1457.

Public Accounts Committee
Reports, Opportunity for discussing.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 19*, 412.

Public Slaughter Houses Bill
l. 1R.* *July 19*, 344.

Public Trustee Bill
Liabilities Incurred by Public Trustees, Defraying out of Consolidated Fund.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *July 18*, 334; Mr. R. Pearce, 334; Mr. J. M. Henderson, 335, 336; Mr. Chairman, 335.
Committee to Authorise Payment of.
Resolution (Mr. Whiteley), *July 18*, 334; Reported, *July 24*, 1176.
Proposals as to.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. G. Whiteley, *July 19*, 403, 404.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 1478.

Queen's County
Crimelessness of, alleged—Revocation of Proclamation, proposed.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1198.
Special Court—Case of J. Starkie.
Qs. Mr. Meehan, Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1199, 1200.

Questions
Arguing, not Permissible, *July 25*, 1188.
Irish—Posting Copies of Replies to Questions not reached during Question Time, proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. L Corbett; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1210, 1211.
Irregular, *July 25*, 1186, 1187.
Irrelevant, *July 19*, 385; *July 24*, 1050; *July 26*, 1463.
Notice to be given of, *July 23*, 713, 716; *July 25*, 1213, 1221; *July 26*, 1447, 1461.

Questions—*cont.*
Past Events, Questions on, Undesirable, *July 18*, 190, 191; *July 19*, 388.
Speech may not be made during Time for, *July 25*, 1197.
Supplementary—Addressing to Minister other than that to whom Original Question was Addressed.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *July 18*, 217.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Railways
Great Eastern Company—alleged Disregard of Acts as to Private Sidings.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 374.
Ireland
Ballinrobe and Claremorris Light Railway, *see* Ballinrobe.
Great Northern
Inconvenience caused by Failure of Derry Train to meet Steamer for Glasgow, etc.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 374.
Mail Trains, Reason for not carrying Third-Class Passengers on.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 18*, 183.
Passenger Trains, Acceleration of Grant paid, etc.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. Mooney, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Mc Kenna, *July 26*, 1474, 1475.
New Companies, Rate of Interest paid by during Construction—Alteration of Present System, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hyde; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 375.
Rating Basis, Legislation to Alter, proposed
Q. Mr. Bertram; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 2*, 1461, 1462.
Tube Railways in London, Precautions against Fire in.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 25*, 1192, 1193.

Railways (Contracts) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 25*, 1221.

Rainy, Mr. A. R. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill—Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17*, 130, 131.

Raphael, Mr. H. H. [Derbyshire, S.]
Stansted Tuberculosis Experimental Farm, Conditions of Using, *July 26*, 1463.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Chelmsford]
  Army—Wastage in Certain Battalions in 1904 and 1905, *July 19*, 366.
  Indian Army—Proportion of Guns to Men, *July 19*, 367.
  Unemployed—Farm and Labour Colonies, Experiments with, *July 9*, 448, 449.

Rathkeale
  Post Office Premises, Eviction of Previous Tenant from, alleged.
    Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23*, 734; *July 25*, 1219.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 225; *Con.*, *July 23*, 754, 755; *July 24*, 1093, 1123, 1134, 1135; *July 25*, 1289.

Rea, Mr. W. R. [Scarborough]
  Dover Harbour (Works, etc.), Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1345–1348, 1351, 1352, 1357, 1361.

Reay, Lord
  Scottish Church Property Dispute—Date of Completion of Work of Commissioners, Inconvenience caused by Delay, etc, *July 20*, 558, 559.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
  Canals Royal Commission, Constitution of—Irish Representation, etc., *July 26*, 1472.
  Croker Estate—Reinstatement Claim of M. Power, *July 25*, 1210.
  Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1169, 1170, 1171.
  Irish Estimates, Allocation of time for, *July 19*, 416, 417; *July 24*, 1056.
  Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 836, 840, 847, 853, 856, 871–873, 888.
  Local Government Board Officials—Information supplied in Return, *July 25*, 1214, 1215.
  Railways—Grant Paid for Acceleration of Trains, *July 26*, 1475.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
  Australian Local Naval Force, Power to Establish, *July 18*, 216.
  Business of the House, Course of, *July 24*, 1057.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.* *July 23*, 779.
  Galway—Condition of County, *July 25*, 1213.
  Income-Tax, Liability of Money Prizes for, *July 23*, 724.
  Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 842, 852, 886.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K.—*cont.*
  Lunacy Commissioners, Increase in Number of, proposed, *July 25*, 1191.
  Natal Native Rising—Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of Bambaata, *July 18*, 189.
  Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill, *Com.*, *July 25*, 1365.
  Revenue Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 326.
  Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, *July 18*, 326.
  Tobacco (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 736.

Reenard
  Pier Improvements, Decision as to.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1181.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
  Africa, South—Rights of British Indians in, *July 23*, 715.
  Agricultural Rates Act, Basis of Payments under, *July 26*, 1431.
  Ceylon—Import Duty on Indian Tea, Decision as to, *July 23*, 709.
  Egypt—Assault by Natives on British Soldier at Mex, *July 19*, 356.
  India.
    Administrative Policy of the Government, *July 20*, 602–608.
    Army—Strength of, Necessity for maintaining, *July 20*, 608.
    Bengal.
      "Black Book," Alleged proposal to publish, *July 19*, 383.
      Partition of—Local Opinion, etc. *July 26*, 1477.
    Cotton Industry in, Encouragement and Development of, proposed, *July 20*, 607.
    Famine Relief, Statistics as to, *July 20*, 603.
    Mortality Rate, Alleged Increase in, *July 20*, 603.
    Natives, Question as to Employment of in higher Administrative Posts, *July 20*, 602.
    Political Agitation in, fostered from Home Sources, *July 20*, 604–608.
    Tiger-slaying—Differential Tariff for Rewards, proposed, *July 19*, 379.
  Indian Office—Salary of Secretary of State, Placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20*, 602, 603, 604.
  South African War — Consideration of Grievances of Senior Reserve Officers, proposed, *July 23*, 695.
  Transvaal—British Indians, Disabilities of *July 20*, 608.

[*cont.*

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
- Turkey
  - Customs Duties, Decision as to, *July 23*, 722.
  - Maaghil Outrage, Persons Implicated in, *July 19*, 356.

Regent Street
- Quadrant, Petition against rebuilding. *Q.* Mr. W. F. D. Smith; *A.* Mr. M'Kenna, *July 17*, 35.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1306.

Rendall, Mr. A. [Gloucester, Thornbury]
- Gloucester Level Commissioners, Constitution, Duties and Powers of, *July 19*, 395.

Reserve Forces Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Public Income and Expenditure (1891–2 to 1905–6)—Return Presented, *July 17*, 16.
- Return (1905–6) Presented *July 23*, 673.

Revenue Bill
- *c.* 2R., *July 18*, 319.
  - *Com.*, *July 25*, 1365.
  - *Rep.** *July 25*, 1367.
  - *Con.* and 3R.* *July 26*, 1560.
  - (For Details of Debate, *see Subjects such as* Alcohol, Wines, Saccharine, Tobacco, Treasury Bills, etc.

Rhodesia
- Gwelo Diamond Area, Powers of Chartered Company to Prohibit Prospecting in *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 710.

Ribblesdale, Lord
- Tobacco Growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 9.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
- Leather, American, Complaints as to Adulteration of, *July 19*, 396.

Richardson, Mr. A. [Nottingham, S.]
- Poisons—Composition of Pharaoh's Serpents' Eggs, Restrictions on Sale, etc., *July 25*, 1192.
- Trade Union Rules, Registration of—Definition of Trade Union, etc., *July 19*, 404.

Richmond, Ireland
- District Lunatic Asylum Accounts—Dispute with Local Government Board *Os.* Mr. Cogan, *July 26*, 1495–1497, 1514; Mr. Bryce, 1513, 1514.

Richmond, Surrey
- Post Office—Proposal as to Further Revision of Duties.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 17, 18.

Ridley, Viscount
- Tobacco-growing in Ireland, Encouragement of, by the Government, Information as to, *July 17*, 9, 10, 12.

Ridsdale, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 148.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal.*
- Army
  - Artillery
    - Importance of, Necessity for Maintaining Full Strength in Men and Guns, etc., *July 24*, 1010.
    - Reorganisation of, proposals as to, *July 24*, 1009, 1010.
  - Expenditure, Necessity for Reduction in, *July 24*, 1012.
  - Guards, Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1008, 1009.
  - *Personnel*—Reduction, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1006.
  - Reorganisation—Opinion of Army Council, *July 24*, 1007.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Progress in House of Lords, *July 20*, 537, 538.
- Militia—Foreign Service, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1011.

Ritz Hotel Bill
- *c. Con.** *July 17*, 13.
  - 3R.* *July 20*, 563.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 24*, 897.

Roberts, Earl
- Army
  - *Personnel*, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 919–921.
  - Reorganisation proposals, *July 24*, 919–931.
  - Unpreparedness for War, *July 24*, 919–931.
  - Voluntary System, Defects of, *July 24*, 922–931.
- Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of Introducing, Cost, etc., *July 24*, 927.
- Defence of the Empire—Expansion outside Limit of Regular Forces, Necessity for, *July 24*, 921–923.
- Militia—Foreign Service, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 923.
- Volunteers—Garrisoning Naval Forts, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 923.

Roberts, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
Liquor Traffic, Revenue derived from, in 1898–9 and 1905–6, *July 19*, 404, 405.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
Unemployed—Shortening Hours of Labour, and widening Basis of Employment, proposed, *July 19*, 456.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Licensed Premises on Estates of, *July 17*, 17.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *July 17*, 70–72.
India
Administrative Policy of the Government, *July 20*, 598–600.
Madras Presidency Liquor Traffic Regulations, *July 19*, 375.
Natives, Question as to Employment of, in Higher Administrative Posts, *July 20*, 599.
India Office—Salary of Secretary of State, Placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20*, 598, 599, 600,

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *con.*, *July 23*, 800–803.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
Battleships
Eight Battleships in full Commission, Cost of, *July 17*, 24.
Reconstruction of Vessels launched prior to 1889, *July 17*, 24.
Coal Consumption by Turbine Machinery, *July 18*, 166.
Dockyards
Devonport, Overtime worked at, *July 19*, 372.
Wages, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 166.
Expenditure of Naval Powers—Information to be given in Return, *July 25*, 1185.
Fishing Grounds, Protection of, against Foreign Trawlers—Services of H.M.S. Julia, etc., *July 25*, 1181.
German Navy, Guns used in, *July 18*, 185.
Greenwich Observatory, Proposals as to, *July 25*, 1185.
Gun Reserve, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1016.
Gunnery Practice in the North Sea—Alleged Waste of Ammunition by Sheerness Reserve, *July 18*, 185.
"Montagu," Expenditure on salving, *July 24*, 1029.
Rosyth, Policy as to, *July 26*, 1412.
Shipbuilding, Programme of — Foreign Nations, Information as to, *July 24*, 1017.
Yealm Fishing Grounds, alleged Injury to, by discharge of Mud, etc., *July 19*, 378.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
Africa, South—Native Definition of, *July 23*, 716.
Egypt
Attack on British Officers in—Opportunity for Discussion of Papers, etc., *July 23*, 737.
British Officials of Ministry of Finance, Pensions awarded to, *July 19*, 392.
Education of Natives—Percentage of Illiterates, *July 19*, 393.
India
Administrative Policy of the Government, *July 20*, 610.
Condition and Progress, Material and Moral, *July 20*, 609.
Delhi, Cocaine Consumption in, *July 19*, 379.
Export and Import Statistics—Proportion to and from Free Trade States of the Far East, as compared with the Protective States of Europe, *July 20*, 609.
Irrigation Works, Progress made with, and Expenditure on, *July 20*, 609.
Mortality Rate, Alleged Increase in, *July 20*, 609.
India Office—Salary of Secretary of State, placing on the Estimates, proposed, *July 20*, 608, 609.
South African War
Chiveiback, Dr., Decision as to Claim of, *July 23*, 711.
Claims—Reopening Question, proposed, *July 26*, 1450, 1451.

Robson, Sir W. S., *Solicitor General* [South Shields]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 83, 86; *Con.*, *July 23*, 766–769; *July 24*, 1129, 1130, 1132, 1133; *July 25*, 1256–1258, 1286, 1296, 1297.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *July 20*, 536.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 26*, 1408.

Rogers, Mr. F. N. [Wilts, Devizes]
Marlborough—Death of Man from Meningitis near—Action of Police and Poor Law Officials, etc., *July 19*, 400.

Roker
Gun Practice, Annoyance caused by.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 26*, 1426.

Roscrea
Castles within the Barracks, Preservation of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25*, 1219.

Roscrea—*cont.*
Sanitary Conditions of Town, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1206.
Water Supply, Proposals for Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1205.

Rose, Mr. C. D. [Cambridge, Newmarket]
Income Tax collected at end of Financial Year, Procedure as to, *July 23*, 723.
Inland Revenue Accounts, Bank at which kept, *July 23*, 723.

Roumania
Customs Duty on Mineral Waters, Rate of.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 355, 356.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Criminals repatriated, *July 23*, 720.

Royal Commissions
Irish, *see under* Ireland.
Statistics as to Appointments by Present Government.
Q. Mr. W. Rutherford; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 216.

Rugby Lower School Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Runciman, Mr. W., *Parlimentary Secretary, Local Government Board* [Dewsbury]
Africa, South, British Indians in—Definition of Coolie or Lascar, *July 25*, 1189.
Africa, West—Labour Conditions in San Thomé and Principé, *July 18*, 193.
Aland Islands, Russian Military Occupation of, *July 25*, 1190.
Ceylon—Trade Statistics, Industrial and Financial Condition, etc., *July 25*, 1189, 1190.
Merchant Seamen's Wages, Charge for Remitting from Foreign Ports, *July 18*, 192; *July 23*, 721.
Turco-Persian Boundary Dispute—Location of Pasova, etc., *July 23*, 721.
Turkey—Customs Duties, Decision as to, *July 23*, 722, 723.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
Administration of Ireland—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26*, 1535.
Aughnacloy extra Police Force, Reason for Employing, etc., *July 19*, 357.
Clanricarde Estate, Situation on, Case of Ward, etc., *July 26*, 1534.

Russell, Mr. T. W.—*cont.*
Cookstown—Pigs seized by Inspector Graham, Result of Test for Tuberculosis in, *July 17*, 22.
Deanery of Manchester Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 832.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 26*, 1476.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 879.

Russia
Customs Tariff, New
Effect of, on British Trade.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 26*, 1456.
Result of British Representations as to.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 355.
Duma, British Government Policy as to—Speech of Prime Minister.
Qs. Lord Turnour; *As.* Sir H. Campbell - Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *July 25*, 1220, 1221.
Geddes, Mr., Case of—Progress of Negotiations.
Q. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 370.
Trade Report Presented, *July 26*, 1370.

Russo-Japanese War
British Vessel seized by Russian Cruiser—Settlement of "Knight Commander" Case.
Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 24*, 1037.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
Army—Plain Clothes—Date of issuing Instructions as to Sergeants, *July 26*, 1443.
Indian Army Medical Service—Specialists appointed, *July 25*, 1188.

Rutherford, Mr. J. [Lancashire, N.E., Darwen]
Army—Proposals as to Third Battalion Coldstream Guards, *July 18*, 177.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, W. Derby]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1157, 1161.
Education Bill—Ministry for Wales, Office Accommodation required for, *July 26*, 1468.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 889, 893.
Liverpool Telegraph Office
Press Messages, Alleged Delay in *July 26*, 1466.
Promotions in, *July 26*, 1466.
Post Office Sites Bill, 3R., *July 17*, 142–144.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 148, 155.

[*cont.*

Rutherford, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
Revenue Bill, *Com., July 25*, 1366.
Royal Commissions Statistics as to, *July 18*, 216.
Telegraph Office Staff, Basis of calculating, *July 26*, 1465.
Toxteth Poor Law Relieving Officer, Appointment of, *July 26*, 1464.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
c. Con. July 18*, 161.
3R.* *July 23*, 830.
l. 1R.* 2R.* *Com.** and *Rep.* July 24*, 898.
Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.
Os. Mr. Menzies, *July 17*, 127–130; Mr. R. Balfour, 130; Mr. Rainy, 130, 131; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 131-135; Mr. E. Wason, 135; Mr. C. Hay, 135, 136; Mr. Sinclair, 136–138; Mr. Cochrane, 138.

Ryfield
Dowd, Mr. J., Allegations of, against Mr. T. Rorke, J.P.—Result of Investigation.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Duffy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1211, 1212.

Saccharine
Law as to, Assimilation of, to that relating to Sugar, etc.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 323; Sir E. Carson, 323.

St. Asaph, Bishop of
Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of—Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26*, 1386–1389.

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill
l. Rep. July 17*, 2.
3R.* *July 23*, 641.

St. Pancras Electricity Bill
l. Rep. July 24*, 897.

Salcombe
Telegraph and Telephone Service, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 19*, 402, 403.

Salford
Devonshire Street Council School, Decision as to charging Fees in.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 19*, 371.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Chester-le-Street, Vaccination Prosecutions at, *July 26*, 1457.
Extradition Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 339; *Com., July 19*, 530, 531.
Fish-curing Industry, Scottish, Sanitary Supervision of, *July 26*, 1459, 1460.
Florists' Assistants, Hours of, *July 26*, 1460.
House of Commons Police—Payment for Extra Duty, *July 26*, 1457.
Leckhampton Right of Way Disturbance—Sentences inflicted, etc., *July 25*, 192; *July 26*, 1458.
Lunacy
Asylums, Architect employed for Altering and Designing, etc., *July 26*, 1461.
Commissioners, Increase in Number of, proposed, *July 25*, 1191; *July 26*, 1459.
Marriage with Foreigners Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 339; *Com., July 19*, 526, 527, 528.
Motors, Accidents from—Licenses, Power to suspend or cancel, *July 26*, 1458, 1459.
Pharaoh's Serpents' Eggs, Composition and Restrictions on Sale of, *July 25*, 1192.
Prisons, Local—Scale of Pay of Officers, *July 26*, 1457.
Railway Rating Basis, Legislation to alter, proposed, *July 26*, 1462.

Sands, Mrs., Estate of
Sale of — Reinstatement Claim of J. Houlihan.
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 202, 203.

Sankey Estate
McTaggart, M.P., Reinstatement Claim of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 690.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Borneo—Position of Affairs in Brunei, *July 26*, 1454.
China, Anhui Mining Final Contract, Information as to, *July 26*, 1454.
Singapore Docks—Tanjong Pagar Dock Company Shares purchased by Federated Malay States, etc., *July 18*, 179.
Tibet Papers, Proposals as to Tabling, *July 26*, 1444.

Saunderson, Col. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Administration of—Policy of Chief Secretary, etc., *July 26*, 1525–1533.
Clanricarde Estate, Situation on, Case of Ward, etc., *July 26*, 1526–1533.
Irish Estimates, Allocation of Time for, *July 19*, 417; *July 24*, 1057.

Scarisbrick, Mr. T. L. [Dorset, S.]
  Motor Omnibuses, Extra Emergency Brake for, proposed, *July 18*, 196.

Schwann, Sir C. E. [Manchester, N.]
  India—Education
    Primary, Condition of, Necessity for betterment of, *July 20*, 619, 620, 621.
    Secondary Schools, Inadequate Number of, *July 20*, 620.

Scientific Societies
  Government Grants during last Fifty Years—Return Ordered, *July 25*, 1179.

Scotland
  Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
  Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
  Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
  See also names of places.
  Church Property Dispute—Date of Completion of Work of Commisioners, Inconvenience caused by Delay, etc.
    Os. Lord Reay, *July 20*, 558, 559; Earl of Elgin, 559–562.
    Q. Sir T. Glen-Coats; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 18*, 167.
  Ecclesiastical Assessments, 1896–1905—Return Ordered, *July 18*, 163.
  Education, *see* Education, Scotland.
  Fisheries, *see under title* Fisheries.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
  Army
    Artillery Reserve, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1025.
    Coldstream Guards, Third Battalion, Decision as to, *July 19*, 365.
  Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1157.
  Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 159.
  Volunteers
    Allocation of 149,000 under new Scheme, *July 19*, 366.
    Training Proposals under New Scheme, *July 19*, 367.

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Sea Fisheries Provisional Order Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Sears, Mr. J. E. [Cheltenham]
  Leckhampton Right of Way Dispute—Sentence on Barrett, etc., *July 26*, 1457.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
  Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
  Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
  Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
  Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
  Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
  Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
  Army *Personnel*—Reduction Proposals, *July 19*, 492, 493.
    Sanction of Parliament to, obtaining, prior to giving effect to Scheme, *July 19*, 491, 492.
  Committee of Defence, Constitution of, *July 23*, 735.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.* *July 18*, 232, 233.
  Merchant Seamen's Wages remitted from Foreign Ports, Charge for, *July 18*, 192; *July 23*, 721.
  Transvaal—Chinese Labour—Opportunity for discussing, *July 17*, 40.

Servia
  Belgrade—Decision as to Establishment of Bank, etc.
    Q. Mr. Baker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 17*, 32.
  Regicide Officers, Text of Decree as to retirement of
    Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19*, 392.

Settled Land Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 25*, 1221.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E. Clitheroe]
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 516.
  Time-cribbing, Employment of Police to prevent—Opinions of Local Authorities, *July 20*, 565.

Shanghai
  Trade Report, Presented, *July 19*, 343.

Shannon Development Company
  Grant to, etc.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25*, 1205.

Shaw, Mr. C. E. [Stafford]
  Education Bill—Clause 4—Vote recorded in wrong Lobby, *July 26*, 1478.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
Perthshire Chief Constable, Report of Burgh Offences by, *July 26*, 1472.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]
Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1168.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 836, 841, 845, 855, 889.

Sheffield
Railway Accommodation, Complaints as to.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 397.

Sheffield District Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Sheriffs, High
Nomination, Procedure in.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1055.

Shetland
Whaling Operations, Danger to Fishing by, alleged.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 26*, 1471.

Shimla River
Fishing Regulations, Enforcement of.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 18*, 214.

Shipman, Dr. J. G. [Northampton]
Poor Law Relieving Officers, Reason for objecting to Women as, *July 19*, 372.

Shop Hours Act
Orders made under, Presented, *July 19*, 354; *July 20*, 537, 564; *July 26*, 1370, 1410.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Powers Bill
c. Rep. July 23*, 671.

Silcock, Mr. T. B. [Somerset, Wells]
Charities, Schemes for Administration of—Procedure in framing Schemes, *July 17*, 36.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 18*, 283, 289.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Achscrabster Allotments Scheme, Costs in connection with, *July 25*, 1179.
Church Property Dispute—Delay in Presenting Report, *July 18*, 167.
Crofters Acts Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 200.
Education—Pupil Teachers
Grants for—Decision as to Abolition, etc., *July 19*, 406.
Status of, after 1914, *July 17*, 37.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Fetlar Road and Bridge Construction, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 199.
Herrings, Close Time for, proposed, *July 26*, 1471.
Lewis
Fisheries—Provision of Hauling Winches for Boats proposed, *July 24*, 1046.
Migration of Cottars to Mainland, Arrangements for, *July 25*, 1196, 1197.
Sanitary Condition, Proposals for improving, *July 18*, 199; *July 25*, 1197.
Water Supply in Schools, Proposals as to, *July 26*, 1470.
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17*, 136–138.
Shetland Whaling Operations—Danger to Fishing alleged, *July 26*, 1471.
Sutherlandshire Main Roads, Improvement of, proposed, *July 19*, 407; *July 24*, 1045.
Trawling—Foreign Trawlers in Prohibited Waters, Decision of Sheriff Guthrie, *July 25*, 1198.
Unemployment Committees formed in Scotland, *July 24*, 1046.
Unst School Board Grant, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1471.
Vatersay, Isle of—Arrangements as to grazing for Cattle of Cottars, *July 18*, 199; *July 25*, 1197.

Singapore
Docks — Tanjong Pagar Dock Company Shares purchased by Federated Malay States, Price paid, etc.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 179.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Army Tailors—Case of Ex-Sergeant Pressley, *July 26*, 1425.
Belfast Post-Office
Holiday for Postmen on 12th July, proposed, *July 26*, 1411, 1436.
Mail Van Drivers, Conditions of Service of, *July 26*, 1436
Promotions in, *July 26*, 1435.
Education
Intermediate—Royal Dublin Society Inquiry in 1897, Information as to, *July 18*, 178.
Teachers in England, Salaries of, *July 25*, 1184.
Feagh National School—Case of Mr. R. I. McCurdy, *July 19*, 376.
Glasgow Postmen, Allowances to *July 25*, 1184.

[*cont.*

Sloan, Mr. T. H.—*cont.*
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 881, 882, 889.
- Malta
  - Funeral Processions, Regulations as to Chaplains attending, *July 26*, 1445–1447.
  - Protestant Services and Processions, Regulations as to, *July 19*, 384, 385.
- Monaghan Post Office Site, Progress made with purchase of, *July 18*, 181.
- Newcastle Foreshore, Board of Trade Control over, *July 26*, 1473.
- Railways—Grants paid for Acceleration of Trains, *July 26*, 1475.
- Taxes, Surveyors of—Salaries and Holidays of Clerks, result of Inquiry, etc., *July 20*, 567, 568.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
- India—Reduction of Area licensed for Poppy Cultivation, *July 17*, 26; *July 19*, 383.
- Pupil Teachers
  - Grants for—Decision as to Abolition, etc., *July 19*, 406.
  - *Status* of, *July 17*, 37.

Smith, Mr. A. H. [Hertfordshire, Hertford]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1266.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
- Army
  - Estimates, Opportunity for discussing, *July 19*, 413.
  - Home Battalions, Proposals as to Reduction of, *July 19*, 469, 470.
  - *Personnel*, Reductions—Sanction of Parliament to, obtaining, prior to giving effect to Scheme, *July 19*, 418, 464–467.
  - Reorganisation Proposals, *July 19*, 467–471.
  - Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, *July 19*, 465–467.
- Defence of the Empire—Expansion outside Limits of Regular Forces, Necessity for, *July 19*, 469.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 41–50, 68, 76, 77, 103, 112.

Smith, Mr. S. [Westmorland, Kendal]
- Army—Deficiency in Regiments selected for Disbandment, *July 18*, 174.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]
- Regent Street Quadrant, Petition against rebuilding, *July 17*, 35.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
- Blackburn Pupil Teacher Centre, Reason for Recommending Abolition of, *July 18*, 169.
- Civil Service Assistant Clerks, New Class, Salaries of, *July 18*, 183.
- Inland Revenue Supervisors—Examination Arrangements, *July 19*, 373.
- Pupil Teachers' Training Centres, Decision as to closing, *July 18*, 197.
- Unemployed Trade Union Reports for May, *July 19*, 373.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devon, Barnstaple]
- Motor Omnibuses
  - Powers of Local Government Board as to Control, *July 17*, 20.
  - Speed Limit in Metropolitan Area, *July 18*, 180.
- Questions, Supplementary, Regulations as to, *July 18*, 217.

Somers Estate
- Farm sold to M. Tracey, Information as to. *Q.* Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 24*, 1024.

Solicitor-General
- *Sir W. S. Robson.*

Solicitor-General for Ireland
- *Mr. R. Barry.*

Solicitor-General for Scotland
- *Mr. A. Ure.*

Soudan
- Bahr-el-Gazal, Evacuation of, by Congolese Troops.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 26*, 1454.
- Khartoum—Vivisection Experiments at Gordon College.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 20*, 568, 569.
- Spirituous Liquors, Statistics as to Importation of.
  - *Qs.* Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 697.

South African War
- Claims
  - Chiveiback, Dr., Decision as to Claim of etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 711.
  - Re-opening Question proposed, *Qs.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1450, 1451.
- Remount Department Administration, Inquiry into, proposed.
  - *Q.* Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 378.

[*cont.*

South African War—*cont.*
Reserve Officers, Senior, Consideration of Grievances of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Haldane. *July 23,* 695.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill
c. *Rep.* July 17,* 14.
Con., July 23, 671.

South Kensington Museum
Loans of Works of Art from, Arrangements for.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23,* 700.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill
l. Rep. July 24,* 897.

South Suburban Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 534.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19,* 341.
Rep. July 24,* 897.
3R.* *July 26,* 1369.

Southampton Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 534.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 19,* 352.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con., July 24,* 898.

Southwark, Bishop of
Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26,* 1395.

Southwell Estate
Evicted Tenants, Inquiries into Cases of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 25,* 1216.

Spain
Valencia—Charge against D. Taylor, Engineer of Ship "Gravina."
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 26,* 1430.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory
See under Army.

Speaker's Rulings
Army
Estimates, Further Time for Discussion—Statements made to *Times* Representative by Member for Croydon, *July 19,* 414.
Reorganisation Proposals—Terms of Motion of Member for Walton Division of Liverpool, *July 19,* 486.

Speaker's Rulings—*cont.*
Education (England and Wales) Bill
Amendments—Definition of Effect of, not the Business of the Speaker, *July 24,* 1131.
Clauses out of Order, *July 23,* 829.
Division—Vote recorded in Wrong Lobby, *July 26,* 1478.
Matter outside Scope of Debate, Introduction of, *July 23,* 748, 757, 806, 815.
Member, having spoken once, could only by Leave of the House speak again, *July 23,* 800.
Teachers' Deferred Annuity Fund, Charge on the Treasury for—Question as to recommitting Bill in order to deal with, *July 23,* 758–760.
Interruptions to Debate, *July 23,* 878.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill
Clauses out of Order, *July 23,* 854.
Matter outside Scope of Debate Introduction of, 881.
Third Reading Stage, Propriety of taking immediately after Amendment on Report Stage, *July 23,* 894.
Matter outside Scope of Subject under Debate, *July 19,* 515; *July 24,* 1144; *July 25,* 1358.
Personal Explanation traversing Member's Statement, Right of Reply to, *July 19,* 414.
Questions, *see that title.*
Subject having been divided on, no further Discussion on that Subject could take place, *July 20,* 619.

Stamps
See under Post Office.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
Religious Instruction in Council Schools, Character of—Information as to Syllabuses and Regulations contained in Return, etc., *July 26,* 1392–1395.

Stanmore, Lord
Parliament, Houses of—Unfinished Condition of Rooms appropriated to Services of the House, etc., Appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry, *July 19,* 344, 345.

Stansted
Tuberculosis Experimental Farm, Expenditure on and Work done by.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 26,* 1432.
Q. Mr. Raphael; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 26,* 1463.

Starkey, Mr. J R. [Nottinghamshire Newark]
Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24,* 1174.

Statistical Abstract (United Kingdom)
Copy Presented (1891–1905), *July 24*, 898, 1014.

Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill
c. 3R., *July 17*, 160.
l. 1R., *July 19*, 344.
2R., *July 26*, 1372.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Finsbury, Central]
Telegraph Service—Regulations as to transmitting Figures, *July 26*, 1435.
Telephone Service—Sunday Duty and Overtime of Women Operators in London Department, *July 23*, 675.

Stockton-on-Tees
Shop Hours Act, Order made under, Presented, *July 19*, 354; *July 20*, 537.

Stoney Estate
Grazing Lands, Disposal of—Number of Tenants emigrating, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 358, 359, 361, 362.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
Dogs Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1156, 1158, 1162, 1165, 1167, 1173, 1175.
Kew Gardens Workers, Reply to Memorial from, *July 24*, 1045.
Open Spaces Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 502.

Straits Settlements
Gambling Houses, Income derived from licensing, etc.
Q. Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1447.

Street Traffic
Commission Report—Proposals for adopting Recommendations.
Q. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 737.

Stuart, Mr. J. [Sunderland]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 258.
Coolgavney—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. M. Rinkle, *July 25*, 1182.
Somers Estate—Sale of Farm to M. Tracey, *July 24*, 1024.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
Kew Gardens Workers, Reply to Memorial from, *July 24*, 1045; *July 26*, 1467.
Roker—Annoyance caused by Gun Practice, *July 26*, 1426.

Sunday Trading
Report, etc., from Joint Committee, Presented, *July 19*, 343, 418.

Supply
See also Army, Navy and Civil Service Estimates.
Irish Estimates—Discussion, Proposals for, Order of taking Votes, etc.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. J. Redmond, Sir E. Carson, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Col. Saunderson, *July 19*, 416, 417.
Q. Mr. A. J. Balfour; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 740.
Scottish Estimates, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 32*, 737, 738.

Sutherlandshire
Main Roads, Improvement of, proposed, *Qs.* Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Sinclair. *July 19*, 407; *July 24*, 1045.

Sutton District Water Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 341.
Report from Select Committee, *July 26*, 1369.

Sutton Southcoates and Drypool Gas Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
Owers Light Ship, Position of, *July 19*, 398, 399.

Talbot, Mr. J. G. [Oxford University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.* *July 18*, 289; *Con.*, *July 24*, 1062 1102, 1111; *July 25*, 1262–1264.
Jam Factories, Overtime Regulations in, *July 17*, 18.

Taxation
Return as to Income Tax, Land Tax and Inhabited House Duty, Presented, *July 18*, 162.
Surveyors' Clerks
Promotions of—Inquiry into Grievances, proposed.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1437–1439.
Salaries and Holidays of, Result of Inquiry, etc.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 20*, 567, 568.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 242; *Con.*, *July 23*, 780–782; *July 24*, 1135–1137.
Malta Protestant Mission Services, Reason for prohibiting, *July 19*, 385.

July 17—*July* 26.

Taylor, Mr. J. W. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Chester-le-Street — Vaccination Prosecution Case of Mr. Dixon, etc., *July 17*, 33; *July 26*, 1457.
Jarrow-on-Tyne Secondary School Fees, *July 26*, 1464.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe]
India—Area licensed for Poppy Cultivation, *July 17*, 26.

Telegraph Service
See also names of places.
Figures, Regulations as to telegraphing. *Q.* Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1435.
Foreign-written Telegram Regulations, Presented, *July 26*, 1370.
Staff required in Offices—Basis of calculating.
Qs. Mr. W. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 1465, 1466.
Wireless Telegraphy, *see that title.*

Telephone Service
See also names of places.
Private Wires over Long Distances, Charge for.
Q. Mr. A. Williamson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 1017, 1018.
Sunday Duty, and Overtime of Women Operators in London Department.
Qs. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23*, 675, 676.

Temple, Earl
Army—Guards
Cost of, compared with the Line, *July 24*, 916.
Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 916–919.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Children, Employment of—Date of Sanctioning London by-laws, *July 23*, 677.

Textile Workers (Saturday and Sunday Holidays) (No. 2) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 17*, 41.

Teynham, Lord
Motor Omnibuses—Noise, Annoyance, and Injury caused by, in London, Measures proposed in Mitigation of, *July 20*, 544, 545.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Coal Mines Inspection in Wales—Duties of Mr. Atkinson, etc., *July 17*, 32; *July 19*, 396.
Welsh Church Disestablishment—Proposals as to Legislative Measures, *July 24*, 1055.

Thomas, Sir A. [Glamorganshire, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 74.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate
Sale proposals—Progress of Negotiations
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 693.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
House of Commons Police—Payment for extra duty, *July 26*, 1456.
Unemployed Distress Committees, Conditions of Obtaining Work from, *July 24*, 1042.
West Ham Workhouse Infant School, Overcrowding in, *July 19*, 399.
Whitehall New Government Buildings—Marble Dressing, etc., Specification, *July 26*, 1467.

Thurso
Letter Delivery in District, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. R. L. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr Buxton, *July 23*, 698.

Tibet
Agreement—Date of Tabling Papers
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 18*, 171.
Papers, Proposals as to Tabling
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 26*, 1444.

Tillett, Mr. L. J. [Norwich]
China Trade Mark Law, Date of bringing into Operation, *July 26*, 1427.
Norwich—Alleged Delay in Telegraphic Transmission from London, of Report of Mr. Haldane's Speech, *July 23*, 677.

Tinahely
Post Office Medical Officer—Appointment of Dr. Bolster.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 24*, 1053, 1054.

Tipperary
Urban Council Accounts Dispute
Os. Mr. Cullinan, *July 26*, 1504, 1505.

Tobacco
Importation of, New Regulations as to
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 323; Mr. T. M. Healy, 328, 329.
Ireland, Cultivation in—Special Facilities and Fiscal Remissions Granted by Government for Encouragement of
Os. Lord Oranmore and Browne, *July 17*, 5, 6, 12; Lord Denman, 6, 10, 12; Earl of Denbigh, 7, 8, 11, 13; Earl of Crewe, 8, 11; Viscount Ridley, 9, 10, 12; Lord Ribblesdale, 9; Earl of Meath, 11; Earl of Camperdown, 11, 12; Mr. W. Redmond, *July 18*, 326; Mr. Asquith, 331.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 688.

Tobacco (Ireland) Bill
  Proposals as to
    Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 736.

Todd-Thornton Estate
  Mullinune Meadows, Sale of
    Q. Mr. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1424.

Todmorden Corporation Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 23*, 641.

Toomebridge
  Petty Sessions Clerk, Avocations of
    Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 26*, 1441, 1442.

Torches
  German—Increase of Trade with Great Britain, Regulations as to Trade Mark, etc.
    Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 18*, 195.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill
  *l. Rep.** *July 17*, 2.
    3R.* *July 23*, 641.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill
  c. Report from Standing Committee on Trade, *July 24*, 1057.

Toxteth
  Poor Law Relieving Officer, Appointment of.
    Q. Mr. W. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 26*, 1464.

Traction Engines
  See under Motors.

Trade, Board of
  President.—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
  Parliamentary Secretary.—Mr. H. E. Kearley.

Trade Reports
  Annual Series Presented, *July 17*, 16; *July 18*, 162; *July 19*, 343, 354. *July 20*, 537; *July 23*, 643, 673; *July 24*, 898; 1015, *July 25*, 1178; *July 26*, 1370.

Trade Unions
  Rules of Union, Registration of—Powers of Chief Registrar as to Definition of Union, etc.
    Q. Mr. Richardson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 19*, 404.

Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 20*, 563.

Transvaal
  Affairs—Further Correspondence Presented, *July 23*, 643, 672.

Transvaal—*cont.*
  Bewaarplatzen, Disposal of.
    Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 718.
  British Indians in, Disabilities of.
    Qs. Mr. Rees, *July 20*, 608.
  Chinese Labour.
    Amusements, Government Support for Provision of.
      Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 19*, 390.
    Corporal Punishment.
      Cason Mine Case—Investigation of Ratcliff's Charges against Jimson, etc.
        Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Chiozza Money; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 29–31.
    Crimes.
      Murders During First Six Months of 1906.
        Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 717.
      Protection of White People, Proposals as to.
        Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 19*, 411.
    Desertions etc., During May and June.
      Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 717.
    Repatriation.
      Amended Notification, Date of Posting up.
        Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 716.
      Criminals—Number Repatriated.
        Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 720.
      Petition of Miners against.
        Qs. Mr. Fiennes, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Lehmann, Mr. Dewar, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 23*, 712, 713.
      Superintendent of Foreign Labour, Duties of.
        Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1445.
  Franchise, Persons Excluded from.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 716.
  Gambling, Crime Due to—Stricter Measures for Dealing with Gambling, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1036.
  Gold Mines, Probable Duration of, etc.
    Q. Mr. Chiozza Money; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1450.

cont.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Native Labour.
Central African Natives — Mortality Returns, (1905–6).
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23,* 717, 718.
Kaffir Recruiting Licences, Delay in Issue of.
Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17,* 31.
Rand Voters' Register, Mr. Solomon's Statement as to Names Enrolled in.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 19,* 386, 387.
White Labour—Experiments, Report on, proposed.
Q. Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24,* 1036.

Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill
Proposals as to Taking.
Qs. Mr. Morton, Mr. Weir; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 19,* 411, 412.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. Power; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23,* 738.

Trawling
Fishery Grounds, Protection of—Services of H.M.S. "Julia."
Q. Sir J. Benn; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25,* 1180, 1181.
Foreign Trawlers in Prohibited Waters, Decision of Sheriff Guthrie as to.
Qs. Mr. Ainsworth, Sir G. Doughty, Mr. Lamont; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 25,* 1197, 1198.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Treasury Bills
Balances at Bank of England, Securing Payment of Interest on, proposed.
Os. Mr. Morton, *July 18,* 327, 331; Mr. Asquith, 331.
Remuneration to Bank of England on Total Amount of Bills Issued in the Year, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18,* 325.
Renewal of, Granting Discretionary Powers as to, to Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *July 18,* 324, 325.

Trent Navigation Company Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20,* 534.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorks, W.R., Elland]
Charities, Administration—Procedure in Framing Schemes, *July 17,* 36.
Crimes—Sentences of Imprisonment on Males over Twenty-one Passed During Last Twelve Months, *July 23,* 699.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P.—*cont.*
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Licensed Premises on Estates of, *July 26,* 1469.
Transvaal Chinese Labour Repatriation, Petition of Miners against, *July 23,* 713.

Trinidad
Borough Council—Decision as to Use of Elective Principle.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24,* 1036.
Financial Condition—Estimates for Current Year, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24,* 1037.
Legislative Council, alleged Unrepresentative System in.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24,* 1035.

Truro Gas Bill
*c. Rep.** *July 17,* 14.
*Con.** *July 23,* 671.
3R.* *July 26,* 1408.

Trustee Savings Banks
Accounts 1904–5 — Return Ordered, *July 23,* 674.

Turco-Persian Boundary
Pasova Question—Attitude of the British Government, etc.
Q. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19,* 391.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 23,* 721.

Turkey
Baghdad Railway, *see that title.*
Customs Duties, Decision as to—Policy of British Government, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lynch, Mr. Rees, Mr. Gooch; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 23,* 721–723.
Q. Mr. Lynch, *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 24,* 1038.
Effect on Turkish Imperial Funds, etc.
Qs. Mr. Bowles, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 26,* 1455, 1456.
Maaghil Outrage, Persons Arrested for Implication in
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 19,* 356.

Turnour, Lord [Sussex, Horsham]
Deanery of Manchester Bill, *Com., July 23,* 831, 832.
Dogs Bill, *Con, July 24,* 1162, 1166, 1171.
Extradition Bill, *Com., July 19,* 530.
Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill, *Con., July 24,* 1149.
Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 23,* 886, 890.

[*cont.*

Turnour, Lord—*cont.*
  Marriage with Foreigners Bill, *Com., July 19*, 528.
  Piershill Barracks, Sanitary Condition of, *July 26*, 1425.
  Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con., July 17*, 157, 158, 159.
  Privileges of Cabinet Ministers—Issue of Passes as to Precedence over Traffic, *July 23*, 726; *July 26*, 1462.
  Revenue Bill, *Com., July 25*, 1365, 1366.
  Russian Duma, British Government Policy as to—Speech of Prime Minister, *July 25*, 1220, 1221.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
  Army
    Artillery
      Importance of, Necessity for Maintaining Full Strength in Men and Guns, etc., *July 24*, 966.
      Reorganisation of, proposals as to, *July 24*, 963, 966.
    Efficiency, Necessity for Maintaining, *July 24*, 970.
    Establishment, Strength of, *July 24*, 969.
    Expeditionary Force, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 972, 973.
    Reorganisation proposals, *July 24*, 966–975.
  Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of Introducing, Cost, etc., *July 24*, 967, 968.
  Defence of the Empire, Total Expenditure on, *July 24*, 969.
  Gibraltar Garrison, proposed Reduction of, *July 24*, 974.
  Malta Garrison, proposed Reduction of, *July 24*, 974.
  Merchant Shipping
    Capture of Vessels at Sea in Time of War—Question of National Indemnity, etc.
      Avoidance of Capture—Instructional Courses at Seaports, proposed, *July 23*, 648.
      Committee of Inquiry—Retention of Services of Naval Member until Completion of Report, *July 23*, 647.
    Ex-Seamen, Employment of, in Government Departments, proposed, *July 20*, 556, 557.
  Militia
    Conditions of Service, *July 24*, 972, 973.
    Foreign Service for, proposals as to, *July 24*, 971.

Tweedmouth Lord—*cont.*
  Militia—*cont.*
    Reduction of, proposals as to, *July 24*, 971.
  Volunteers, Organisation of, by Means of County Associations, *July 24*, 973.

Twickenham
  Urban District Council Powers as to Inquiry into Religious Denomination of Teachers.
    Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 700.

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill
  c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *July 20*, 562.

Uganda
  Native Unrest, Reports as to
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 713, 714.
  Sleeping Sickness in—Removal of Seat of Government to Kampala, proposed
    Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1452.

Ulster
  Celebrations on 12th July, Breaches of the Peace during.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 23*, 694, 695.

Unemployed
  Afforestation as a solution of the Problem.
    Os. Mr. Alden, *July 19*, 446; Mr. J. Burns, 460, 461.
  Distress Committees, Conditions of obtaining work from.
    Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 24*, 1042, 1043.
  Dock, Casual and unskilled Labour, Proposals for dealing with.
    Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 428, 429, 460; Mr. Crooks, 442; Mr. Alden, 444, 445.
  Farm and Labour Colonies, Experiments with.
    Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 19*, 432, 433; Mr. Long, 436, 437; Mr. Alden, 448; Sir C. Rasch, 448, 449; Mr. J. Ward, 453.
  Grant for, from Consolidated Fund, proposals as to.
    Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 427, 428, 461; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 433; Mr. Masterman, 439, 440; Mr. H. Cox, 454, 455; Mr. E. Davies, 458.
    Ireland—Sum allocated to.
      Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Bryce, *July 23*, 694.
      Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 24*, 1042.

[*cont.*

Unemployed—*cont.*

Grant for, from Consolidated Fund, etc.—*cont.*

Scotland, Sum allocated to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1027, 1028.

Labour Bureaux, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Alden, *July 19*, 446, 447.

Problem, Method of dealing with—Question of Agricultural Districts, etc.
Os. Mr. Vivian, *July 19*, 449–451; Mr. G. White, 456, 457; Mr. E. Davies, 457, 458; Mr. Barnard, 459.

Relief Works, Objections to.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 425; Mr. J. M. Macdonald, 430; Mr. Masterman, 439; Mr. H. Cox, 455.

Shortening hours of Labour, and widening Basis of Employment, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Ward, *July 19*, 453; Mr. G. Roberts, 456.

Skilled Labourers temporarily out of Employment, necessity for dealing with.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 431, 432; Mr. Crooks, 442-444.

Statistics as to.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 463.

Trade Union Reports for May.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 19*, 373.

"Unemployable" class, Suggestions for dealing with.
Os. Mr. J. Burns. *July 19*, 423, 424; Mr. Crooks, 442, 443.

Women—Statistics as to.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 420, 462; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 432.

Unemployed Workmen's Act, 1905

Administration of—Working of Distress Committees, number of Applicants number relieved, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 419–429; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 430; Mr. W. Long, 434–438; Mr. Crooks, 441.

Statement [Mr. J. Burns], *July 19*, 419–429.

Amendment of—Government proposals as to.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 419, 426, 427; Mr. Long, 438.

Cost of Operation, Sources from which money was drawn, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 422, 423.

Defects in, and alleged failure of.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 425, 426, 462; Mr. Long, 434, 438; Mr. Crooks, 440, 441.

Scotland, Committees formed in.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 24*, 1046.

Unst

School Board Grant, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 26*, 1471.

Ure, Mr. A.—*Solicitor-General for Scotland* [Linlithgow]

Statute Law Revision [Scotland] Bill, 3R *July 17*, 160.

Urlingford

The Loughens, Drainage Charge levied on.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1419.

Uxbridge Gas Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Vaccination

Exemption Certificates.

See also Names of Places.

Applicants residing outside magistrate's Area, Power to grant Certificate to.
Q. Mr. H. R. Mansfield; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 193.

Number granted in 1904 and 1905.
Q. Major Coates; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 26*, 1431, 1432.

Pupil Teachers, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Liddell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 19*, 405.

Vagrants

Ireland, in, Necessity for dealing with.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, *July 26*, 1503, 1504; Mr. Bryce, 1515.

Report of Committee on—Proposals as to dealing with Vagrants, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Burns, *July 19*, 424, 425; Mr. Long, 437.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 19*, 372, 373.

Valentia, Lord [Oxford]

Postage on Literature for the Blind, *July 18*, 196.

Vatersay, Isle of

Cottar's Cattle on, Arrangements as to.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 18*, 199; *July 25*, 1197.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Bucks., N.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 266; *Con.*, *July 23*, 799; *July 25*, 1245, 1246.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]

Army

Personnel—Reduction Proposals, *July 19*, 494–497; *July 23*, 706–708.

Army Council, Views of, *July 24*, 1031, 1032.

[*cont.*

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H.—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Reorganisation Proposals — Opportunity for Adequate Discussion, *July 19*, 495.
- Deanery of Manchester Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 500.
- Egypt—British Garrison, Effect of Reduction of, in 1905, *July 24*, 1031.
- Indian Gold Standard Reserve, Amount of, etc., *July 26*, 1439.
- Militia
  - Foreign Service, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 496, 497.
  - Striking Force, Proposals as to obtaining Men for, *July 24*, 1032.
- Public Trustee Bill, proposals as to, *July 19*, 403; *July 26*, 1478.
- Roumanian Customs Duty on Mineral Waters, *July 19*, 355.
- Russia, Customs Tariff, New — Result of British Representations, *July 19*, 355; *July 26*, 1456.
- Sheffield Railway Accommodation, Complaints as to, *July 19*, 397.
- Turco-Persian Boundary Dispute—Location of Pasova, *July 23*, 721.
- Volunteers, Artillery—Decision as to 15-Pounder Guns, *July 19*, 365.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
- Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1348–1350.
- Unemployed Problem, Method of Dealing with, *July 19*, 449–451.

Volunteers
- Artillery
  - Disbanding, Proposals as to.
    - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 184.
  - Guns—Decision as to 15-Pounders.
    - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 365, 366.
  - Lanark and 4th West Riding, Proposals as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 368, 369.
- Garrisoning Naval Forts by, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Earl Roberts, *July 24*, 923.
  - *Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 366, 367.
- Organisation of, by means of County Associations.
  - *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 913; Lord Tweedmouth, 973; Earl of Erroll, 998.
- Postal Employees, *see* Post Office—Volunteers.
- Training Proposals under New Scheme.
  - *Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 19*, 367.

Wages Board Bill
- Facilities for Taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Chiozza-Money; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 1476.

Walker, Col. W. H. [Lancashire, S.W., Widnes]
- Militia Garrison Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 175.
- Nigeria
  - Cotton Cultivation, Labour Available for, *July 17*, 28.
  - Railway Construction, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 28.

Wallasey Tramways and Improvements Bill
- *c.* *Con.* July 18*, 161.
  - 3R.* *July 23*, 671.
- *l.* Commons Amendts. *Con.* July 26*, 1369.

Walton, Sir J. L.—*Attorney-General* [Leeds, S.]
- Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill, 3R., *July 18*, 338.
- Education Bill—Section 37, Subsection (8), Order in Council made under—Means of Preventing from coming into Force, *July 23*, 733.
- Land Registry—Compulsory Registration of Title, proposed, *July 23*, 699.
- Law Courts, Ireland—Cases Tried in King's Bench Division, *July 26*, 1474.
- Marine Insurance Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1557, 1558, 1559.
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 508–510, 516–518, 521.
- Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 150–153, 159.

War Office
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
- *Parliamentary Under-Secretary*—Earl of Portsmouth.
- *Financial Secretary* — Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
- Contracts—Hackford Provision Company, Tenders received from.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 184.
- New Building, *see* Whitehall.

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendts. *Con.* July 17*, 4.
- Royal Assent, *July 20*, 535.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
- Housing of the Working Classes—Acquisition of Land by Local Authorities for Rural and Urban Housing Schemes, proposed, *July 19*, 452.

[*cont.*

Ward, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Kinder Reservoir Works—Reason for Stoppage of, *July 19*, 401.
Natal Native Rising.
Ammunition used by White Troops, *July 19*, 387, 388.
Native Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 18*, 186.
Unemployed
Farm and Labour Colonies, Experiments with, *July 19*, 453.
Shortening Hours of Labour and widening Basis of Employment, proposed, *July 19*, 453.

Warde, Col. C. E. [Kent, Medway]
Education—School Buildings Improvements, etc., Delay in Sanctioning, pending passing of Bill, proposed, *July 18*, 182.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill—Referring to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, *July 17*, 135.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Africa, West—Freight Rates to, *July 26*, 1451.
Fetlar Road and Bridge Construction, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 198.
Fish-Curing Industry—Sanitary Supervision of Ships, etc., *July 26*, 1460.
Herrings, Close Time for, proposed, *July 26*, 1470.
Nigeria—Return of Chief Nana, *July 26*, 1448.
Shetland Whaling Operations—Danger to Fishing alleged, *July 26*, 1471.
Uganda, Sleeping Sickness in—Removal of Seat of Government to Kampala, proposed, *July 26*, 1452.
Unst School Board Grant, Decision as to, *July 26*, 1471.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 17*, 13.

Water Supply
Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 1194.

Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 534.

Watford Gas Bill
c. Lords' Amend. *Con.* July 20*, 562.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill
l. Rep. July 20*, 535.
3R.* *July 26*, 1369.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
Post Office—Age for Retirement, *July 18*, 167.
Rhodesia—Gwelo Diamond Area, Powers of Chartered Company to Prohibit Prospecting in, *July 23*, 710.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Licensed Premises on Estates of, *July 26*, 1469.
Laundries, Inspection of
Religious, etc., Institutions, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 728.
Rule as to divulging Names given in Reports, *July 23*, 727.
South Kensington Museum and Arrangements for Loan of Works of Art from, *July 23*, 700.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Crofters Acts Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 200; *July 26*, 1475.
Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1174.
Edinburgh Royal Scottish Museum, Ventilation of, *July 26*, 1468.
Invergordon, Proposals as to Naval base at, *July 23*, 705.
Lewis, Island of
Fisheries—Provision of Hauling Winches for Boats proposed, *July 24*, 1046.
Migration of Cottars to mainland, Arrangement for, *July 25*, 1196, 1197.
Sanitary Condition, Proposals for Improving, *July 18*, 199; *July 25*, 1197.
Water Supply in Schools, Proposals as to, *July 26*, 1470.
Motors
Accidents from
Licences, Power to Suspend or Cancel, *July 26*, 1458, 1459.
Metropolitan Area Statistics for June—Proposals for Protection of Public, etc., *July 19*, 397.
Monthly Return proposed, *July 24*, 1040.
Provincial Statistics for May and June, *July 19*, 394.
Licences suspended or Cancelled during 1906, *July 23*, 726.
Petroleum Combustion, Noxious Odours Caused by, *July 23*, 725; *July 24*, 1040.
Taxing in Proportion to Horse-Power, proposed, *July 23*, 681.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J.—*cont*
National Galleries (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1057.
North Sea Scientific Investigations, Progress made with, *July 25*, 1220.
Police Accidents, Monthly Returns as to, proposed, *July 24*, 1039.
Railways, Tube—Precautions Against Fire, *July 25*, 1192.
Trawlers' Certificates Suspension Bill, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 412; *July 23*, 738.
Unemployed.
  Committees formed in Scotland, *July 24*, 1046.
  Grant—Sum Allocated to Scotland, *July 24*, 1027.
Vatersay, Island of—Arrangements as to Grazing for Cottars' Cattle, *July 18*, 199; *July 25*, 1197.

Welsh Church
Disestablishment—Proposals as to Legislative Measures.
  Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1055.

West Ham
Workhouse Infants' School, Overcrowding in.
  Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 19*, 399.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill
c. 3R.* *July 20*, 563.
l. Common's Amendts. *Con.*,* *July 23*, 642.

Westbourne Park Chapel
Assessment of—Amendment of Law proposed.
  Q. Mr. Chiozza Money; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 1195.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill
c. *Con.** *July 18*, 161.
3R.* *July 25*, 1177.
l. Common's Amendts. *Con.*,* *July 26*,1369.

Westminster Palace Court
Documents of not Sufficient Value to justify Preservation—List, etc., Presented, *July 18*, 163; *July 19*, 343.

Wheathampstead School
Sanitary Condition, etc., of
  Q. Mr. H, R. Mansfield; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 24*, 1043.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 283; *Con.*, *July 25*, 1264-1236.

White, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Unemployed, Problem of—Method of Dealing with—Question of Agricultural Districts, etc., *July 19*, 456, 457.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Musical Copyright Act, 1902, Police employed under, *July 23*, 739.
Musical Copyright Bill—Proposals as to Third Reading, *July 23*, 739.

White, Mr. P. [Meath, N.]
Poor Law Medical Officers—New Rules as to Proficiency in Vaccination, *July 18*, 213.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *con.*, *July 17*, 156.

Whitehall
New Government Buildings — Marble Dressing, etc., Specifications as to.
  Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 26*, 1467.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E.]
Customs Watcher, Pay of, *July 26*, 1438.

Whiteley, Mr. G.—*Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury.* [Yorks., W. R., Pudsey]
Deanery of Manchester Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 831, 832.
Parliamentary Procedure
  Adjournment of the House, proposed, *July 19*, 529.
  Autumn Session, Date of Beginning, *July 20*, 640.
Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Con.*, *July 17*, 154.
Public Trustee Bill, Proposals as to, *July 19*, 404.
Revenue Bill, *Com.*, *July 25*, 1366.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1356.

Wigan
Shop Hours Act, Order made under, Presented, *July 9*, 354; *July 20*, 537.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
Postmen, Civil Rights of, in Regard to County Council Elections, *July 23*, 676.

Wilkie, Mr. A. [Dundee]
Post Office Mail Bag Cloth,Contract for, *July 19*, 403.

Williams, Col. R. [Dorset, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 91.

Williams, Mr. W. L. [Carmarthen District]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 96–98.

Williamson, Mr. A. [Elgin and Nairn]
  Anstruther Harbour Improvement, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1017.
  Telephone Service—Charge for Private Wires over Long Distances, *July 24*, 1017.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 18*, 296.

Wills, Mr. A. W. [Dorset, N.]
  Africa, South—Milk, Skimmed, Import Duty on, *July 23*, 709.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorks, E.R., Holderness]
  Post Office (Literature for the Blind) Bill, *Com., July 25*, 1364.

Wilson, Mr. C. H. [Hull, W.]
  Navy—Coal Consumption Statistics, *July 18*, 166.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorks, W.R., Holmfirth]
  India—Opium sold for Export (1901–1907), *July 17*, 21.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con., July 19*, 504.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1074.

Wines
  British
    Excise Duty on Licences for Sale of—Committee to Authorise Imposition of
      Resolution [Mr. Whiteley], *July 18*, 340; *July 19*, 531; Reported, *July 20*, 638.
    Use of Foreign Grape "must" in Manufacture of—Registration of Manufacturers.
      Qs. Mr. McKenna, *July 18*, 323, 324; Mr. C. Hay, 327; Mr. T. M. Healy, 329, 330; Mr. Asquith, 330.

Winfrey, Mr. R. [Norfolk, S.W.]
  Dogs Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1169.
  Education—Children of one Local Education Authority educated by another, Payment for, *July 17*, 19.

Wireless Telegraphy Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 20*, 533.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill
  c. Con. July 17*, 13.
    3R.* *July 20*, 563.
  l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 24*, 897.

Withington
  Workhouse, Alleged Defects in Administration of.
    Qs. Mr. Fullerton; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 19*, 401.

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill
  c. 3R.* *July 18*, 161.
  l. Commons Amendts. *Con., July 20*, 535.

Woodroffe Estate
  Untenanted Lands, Disposal of.
    Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 19*, 364, 365.

Workhouses
  Ireland
    Administration and Cost of, Allegations as to.
      Qs. Mr. J. P. Farrell, *July 26*, 1488, 1489.

Workmen's Compensation Act
  Reduction of Allowance, Powers of County Court Judge as to.
    Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 728, 729.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1104.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]
  Dover Harbour (Works etc.,) Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 1350–1354, 1358.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 17*, 84–86, *Con., July 23*, 785–788; *July 24*, 1093.

Yealm
  Fishing Grounds, Alleged Injury to, by discharge of Mud, etc., from Dockyard.
    Q. Mr. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 19*, 378.

Yeomanry
  North of Ireland—Pay during Training, etc.
    Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Haldane, Mr. Speaker, *July 25*, 1186, 1187.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]
  Post Office Mail Service — Apportionment of Subsidy paid to Peninsular and Oriental Company, *July 17*, 18.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 18*, 284.
  Richmond (Surrey) Post Office—Proposal as to Further Revision of Duties, *July 17*, 17.
  Twickenham Urban District Council Powers as to Inquiry into Religious Denomination of Teachers, *July 23*, 700.

Zanzibar
  Slavery on Mainland, Decision as to Abolition of.
    Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 26*, 1448.
  Trade Report, Presented, *July 23*, 643.

Zoological Gardens
  Grants to, Admission on Sundays, etc.
    Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 26*, 1468, 1469.